A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND

A. R. MACEWEN

£3.00
set of 2.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND

BY

ALEX. R. MACEWEN, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN NEW COLLEGE
EDINBURGH

VOL. II
1546-1560

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO

Printed in 1918

PREFATORY NOTE

THE first volume of Dr. MacEwen's *History of the Church in Scotland*, published in 1913, covered the period up to the eve of the Reformation. His work was arrested by illness, and at the time of his death he had only completed the following five chapters, which carry the narrative to 1560. They were left by him ready for the press. Thanks are due to the Rev. D. M. W. Laird, M.A., for verifying the references.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XXIII

SCOTLAND IN RENAISSANCE

PAGE

Scotland emerges from medievalism—National characteristics—The landed gentry—Municipal developments and foreign trade—'The Commonalty'—Political and religious changes contemporaneous—George Buchanan 1

CHAPTER XXIV

THE OLD FAITH AND THE NEW

1546-1559

Religion on the Continent—Protestantism in England—The churchmen triumph at St. Andrews—English and French invaders—The French marriage and the Catholic menace—Churchmen persecute heresy—Reforming enactments of Privy Council—Adam Wallace—Hamilton's Catechism—Inefficiency of the Bishops—Anarchy in Church Life—The *Compendius Tractive*—Martyrdom of Myln—The churchmen arraigned—Last attempts at reform and the 'Twopenny Faith' 13

CHAPTER XXV

PROGRESS OF REFORMATION

1546-1559

Knox at St. Andrews—His early eminence and his preaching—His life in exile—Spread of Protestantism—The work of the preachers—Religion of the gentry—Knox in England—His contentions and their influence—Switzerland and Frankfort—Visit to Scotland—Guidance of the Reformers—'The face of

PAGE

a Kirk'—Origin of the eldership—Manifestations of reforming spirit and the First Covenant—The Congregation and the Lords—*The First Blast* and the *Appellation*—The Regent and the preachers—'The battle approacheth'—Return of Knox 49

NOTE P.—'Till Our Gude Man'; 'Hay Trix, Tryme go Trix.' By William Dunbar, ... 94

CHAPTER XXVI

'THE UPROAR FOR RELIGION'

May 1559-August 1560

Importance of the crisis—Knox's personality and leadership—Outbreak at Perth—The Regent's duplicity—Triumph of the Reformers—Cleansing of churches—Its motive and extent—Question of national liberty—Attitude of foreign powers—Elizabeth, Knox and Cecil—Appeal for English aid—The Regent in power—Policy of Elizabeth—Growth of the Congregation—Vicissitudes of fortune—The power of Knox—Intrigues and success of the Regent—Help from England—Berwick—Death of the Regent—Edinburgh—Claims of the Congregation—The Confession of Faith—Parliamentary enactments—Peaceful character of the Scottish Reformation 98

CHAPTER XXVII

CREED AND POLITY: CONFESSION OF FAITH AND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE

1560

Knox's *History*—The *Confession of Faith*—Its doctrinal teaching—Conception of the Church—The sacraments—The civil magistrate—Authority of the Bible—Preparation and purpose of the *Book of Discipline*—Provision of religious agencies—The office of Superintendent—A democratic Church—Education—Discipline and its enforcement—Church finance—History and features of the *Book* 148

INDEX 179

CHAPTER XXIII

SCOTLAND IN RENAISSANCE

Scotland emerges from medievalism—National characteristics—The landed gentry—Municipal developments and foreign trade—'The Commonalty'—Political and religious changes contemporaneous—George Buchanan.

In the preceding volume we have seen the growing inefficiency of the Roman Church in Scotland and the gladness with which the teaching of the Reformers was welcomed. But these causes do not suffice to explain the completeness of the revolution which took place. In the half century that followed Flodden, the Scottish nation developed rapidly and came to exhibit features of which previously there had been scarcely a trace. It would be misleading to speak of a Renaissance in the strict sense, for, with one brilliant exception, Scotland made no contribution to that revival of classical literature and art which in the fifteenth century took shape in Italy and spread thence into different parts of western Europe.[1] But the term Renaissance may be used, in a wider sense, to designate generally the emergence from medievalism which preceded or accompanied the Reformation—the process by which intellectual and spiritual energies which had been latent in the Middle Ages were brought into play. A wonderful movement it was, displaying, when we look at it as a whole, the versatility of the faculties of man, the resources of mind as mind and the continuity of the world plan, and giving promise, in rainbow colouring across a storm-swept sky, of the advent of the modern world and the fertility of the modern spirit.

[1] See vol. i. pp. 386, 391, 413.

When we scrutinize the movement in Scotland, we find no swift or startling change, but a gradual process of enlightenment, the permeation of society in all its grades and classes by new ideas and ideals and the rise of new relationships, social, economic and political, resulting in emancipation from a bondage which had been due partly to ignorance, partly to isolation, partly to feudal obligations and the barbarisms of clan life. Political historians have frequently ascribed the revolution which took place in 1560 to those diplomatic negotiations which were recorded in State Papers, and specially to the change in the relations of Scotland to France and England; while many Church historians have written as if feudalism and the papacy had been omnipotent in their respective departments, until they gave way before the aggressions of Geneva Protestantism. But in fact these were only consequences, or, at the most, stages, of a transformation which was assured, if not accomplished, at a time when England was still regarded as the 'Auld Enemy,' and before Calvin had set foot in Switzerland.

It was not at the universities that the old régime was first disturbed. Aberdeen University was at this stage a closely guarded seminary of the Church, Glasgow was impoverished and barren, and the light which shone at St. Andrews between 1520 and 1530 was extinguished by the Beatons.[1] It was the same in monasteries and friaries. The stray endeavours which were made to foster learning were crushed by the Church—not through dislike for learning, but because she could not tolerate the claim for Church reform and religious freedom which arose from the spread of secular knowledge. Outside universities and monasteries, literature had passed out of the hands of Henryson and Dunbar into the charge of David Lyndsay, and in his keeping poetry almost ceased to be poetry.[2] Like most successful satirists, Lyndsay was at heart a teacher of ethics, a social reformer, an advocate and occasionally a platform orator. His

[1] In 1557 St. Andrews had only thirty-one students; in 1558 the number was reduced to three.—*Cambridge History of English Literature*, ii. 371.

[2] See vol. i. 448.

didactic intention was so ardent and insistent that literature was diverted into channels of pragmatism, where men could not see the wider horizons nor breathe the air of world-wide culture. So far as he assailed the Church and 'branded the vices of his age,' he was a modern; but he was not a true child of the Renaissance nor even a humanist, and his verse gave place without a break to the virile, stinging prose of Knox.

For centuries the Scottish temperament had been indefinite, crude, ambiguous,[1] so that on the Continent the wandering Scots were habitually confused with Irishmen; but in the half century we have in view Scotland became a factor in European politics and the national genius was defined with such distinctness that rarely thereafter did any one mistake the Scots for Irish. Erasmus in *The Praise of Folly* (1511) alleges that the Scots of his time were proud of their noble birth and their dialectical acumen.[2] Four years later, Margaret Tudor's chaplain wrote: 'In this country every man speaks what he will without blame; the man hath more words than the master, and will not be content until he knows the master's counsel; there is no order among us.'[3] John Major, writing in 1521, recognizes that the Scots of his time are charged with contentiousness, and seeks to parry the charge by suggesting that the foreigners who made it may have heard Scotsmen disputing about benefices before the Roman Court. He also admits that Scottish aloofness and independence were registered in a current maxim: 'Il est fier comme un Ecossais.' Scotsmen all boast that they are of royal birth. 'I am not able,' he says, 'to acquit my countrymen of this fault: both at home and abroad those of them who are of lowly parentage delight in speaking of themselves as though they came of

[1] 'In a few individual instances the subtile, fervid, and indefatigable mind which, according to Galileo, marked the Scots at the era of the Revival of Letters, was to be seen amongst the Scottish scholars and philosophers of this remote age,' *i.e.* the age of Duns Scotus.—Tytler, *History of Scotland* (ed. 1841), ii. 289.

[2] '*Scoti nobilitate et regiae affinitatis titulo neque non dialecticis argutiis sibi blandiuntur.*'—*Stultitiae Laus* (Basel ed.), p. 102.

[3] Quoted by Lang, *John Knox and the Reformation*, p. 4.

a noble stock. . . . I proceed to ask, whether Adam was of noble birth or no. . . . You must grant that all men are noble or that all are ignoble. Concerning the first nobleman I ask, how came he by his nobility? There is no true nobility but virtue and the evidence of virtue. That which is commonly so called is but a windy thing of human devising.'[1] These maxims are set forth by this 'maker of puddings,' as Rabelais styles Major, very clumsily and with slipshod logic, but they show that Major had reached a truth which the humanists who scoffed at him would not accept, a truth which John Knox forced rudely upon Queen Mary and which has regulated the ideals and attainments of modern Scotland. The diffusion of such sentiments was so closely connected with the spread of a democratic doctrine of the Church that it is difficult to discriminate the two as effect and cause. Yet Major was a convinced upholder of the papal system; he wrote several years before Lutheranism had reached Scotland, and he regarded the burning of Patrick Hamilton as a service rendered to Christ. Manifestly, therefore, the features of national character which he depicts and vindicates must not be ascribed exclusively to religion.[2] They were not only in embryo, but visible and operative. It is essential to an impartial estimate of Church developments that we should take note, however briefly, of certain political, municipal and social movements which synchronized with the Reformation.

1. The younger and less wealthy of the nobility and gentry claimed and secured a right to take part in national affairs. Until the fifteenth century was near its close, Scotland had nothing that can be called a representative assembly.[3] Yet under James III and James IV, there

[1] Major, *History of Greater Britain*, p. 43 ff. Major recognizes that the Scottish gentry 'educate their children neither in letters nor in morals' but repudiates more discreditable charges; he quotes a French saying: 'The Scot brings in a small horse first, and afterwards a big one.'

[2] J. A. Froude, in his sketch of the influence of the Reformation on the Scottish character, ignores the developments recorded in the following pages, particularly the emancipation of burghal and rural life.—*Short Studies on Great Subjects* (ed. 1895), i. 157 ff.

[3] See Rait, *The Scottish Parliament before the Union of the Crowns*; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament, 1603-1707*.

were, as we have seen, tokens of a rising independence in parliament. The movement was checked at Flodden, when the ranks of the nobility were thinned and power passed for a time into the hands of wealthy churchmen. But gradually parliament felt the pressure of men who were outside the few favoured families which previously had managed State affairs.[1] It was largely from their members that the so-called English party was recruited, for they were jealous of the wealth and power of churchmen and therefore hostile to all papal interests. The nearest resemblance on the Continent was to be seen in the German knights who responded to Ulrich von Hutten's war-cry, *Jacta est alea: Ich hab' es gewagt*;[2] but there was this weighty difference, that in Scotland there was no such cleavage of rank as that between the knights and the higher nobility of central Europe. The landed gentry were entitled without a revolution to take a place in parliament, and their attendance at those sessions by which the revolution was accomplished was larger than at any previous stage of Scottish history. The mediating function discharged by many of them is well illustrated by the career of Erskine of Dun, who occupied a prominent place in politics and even in high diplomacy, while holding the office of provost of Montrose. The extent of their interest in religion varied indefinably. Some, like Erskine, were devout men eager for religious reform; others were political adventurers who changed sides without scruple; none were steady champions of the old Church.

2. Burgh life developed rapidly both in vitality and organization. The burghs were as yet small compared with the great Free Cities of the Continent. Although Edinburgh in the middle of the sixteenth century had 30,000 inhabitants, and Dundee, which came next in size, 15,000, it is improbable that the population of any other town was

[1] W. L. Mathieson, in his *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, designates these men 'the inferior gentry.' The Queen Regent, writing in 1557, says that while 'les grands' acquiesce in her schemes, 'la noblesse' side with 'le peuple' and with them constitute 'la commune' in suspecting and opposing her.—*Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots* (S.H.S.), p. 425.

[2] See vol. i. 400.

above 4000. Yet even the smaller burghs disclosed an independent spirit, regulating their trade imposts, their markets and their social and domestic customs by municipal enactments. Like the junior barons, they were growingly hostile to the Church. Apart from their envy of rich bishops and abbots,[1] they despised the ordinary clergy as incapable and inefficient. For nearly a century the charge of education had been passing into their hands.[2] While monastic schools rapidly decayed, burgh schools were multiplied. At Perth grammar school there were at the beginning of the sixteenth century three hundred pupils; it was a lay provost who introduced the teaching of Greek at Montrose; and the principal schools founded in the fifteenth century were burghal institutions. Similarly, town councils on their own initiative voted stipends and assigned lands to friars who discharged pastoral offices neglected by parish priests; and frequently, without consulting bishop or any central authority civil or religious, they determined who should be the preachers in town churches. Accordingly, when the choice between the old Church and the new was made, it was made first by burghs, one by one, before parliament had even approached the religious question. That devolution of large responsibilities upon local authorities which gave presbyterianism its strength was founded not upon the ecclesiastical theories of Calvin, but upon an indigenous development contemporary with the Reformation. It is specially important to note that these municipal developments became effective in Scotland far later than in other lands.

3. In the burghs the artisans had entered upon a struggle with the privileged burgesses for a share in municipal affairs. This contention, too, had taken place much earlier on the Continent. In Germany, as early as the thirteenth century, the crafts secured a place in town councils, and in the fourteenth century they triumphed almost everywhere.

[1] For national assessments the landed property of burghs was rated at only one fifth, whereas churchmen owned a full half of the land.

[2] See vol. i. 413, 455.

But in Scotland, although an Act of 1425 or 1426 sanctioned some trade organization, the sanction proved ineffective, and for nearly a hundred years civic life was dominated by 'merchants,' the deacons of trades being regarded with suspicion and restrained by specific enactments. As the sixteenth century dawned, however, a new movement took shape and issued in a keen and protracted combat between the merchants, who were upheld in their monopoly by the Crown, and the artisan class, which grew yearly in resourcefulness. Before the accession of Mary Stewart twelve trades, including the industries of weavers, candle-makers and masons, had secured royal charters which practically sealed the doom of medieval privilege. This controversy was not in itself a religious one. It was an economic battle which had been fought out in other countries when the religious question was still in the far distance. In Scotland the same half century witnessed uprisings against civic and against spiritual monopoly.[1]

4. These movements were accelerated by the increase and systematizing of foreign trade with the interchange of ideas involved. Although there was some importation of wines and dried fruit from Bordeaux, the Baltic continued to be the main highway of trading.[2] The connexions of Leith, Dundee, Arbroath, Montrose and Aberdeen with the ports of the Low Countries, and with Dantzig, became channels through which social, economic and religious ideas were transmitted; and, at a time when there was an almost impenetrable bar to friendly intercourse with England, the nation participated involuntarily in the perturbation of the European cataclysm. It was in east coast towns that burgh life first developed, elementary education was diffused, and a tax upon Church properties begun; by Leith and Aberdeen shippers that Bibles and Lutheran literature were imported;

[1] Hume Brown, *Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary*, p. 144 ff.

[2] See vol. i. 413. On trading relations with Malmö and Hamburg in 1545 and 1549, see Fischer, *Scots in Germany*, p. 21. About 1550 both the librarians in the Fuggershaus were Scots.—*Ibid.*, p. 227. In 1556 Sigismund of Poland issued an edict against 'wandering Scots.'—*Scots in Eastern and Western Prussia*, p. 157.

by Dundee priests, who had sojourned in Germany, that the hymns of the German Reformers, adapted to the tunes of Scottish ballads, were used for the dissemination of the new beliefs.[1]

5. The awakening of the peasant class was even more important, since it affected the whole country, except the remote highland districts; and it was more distinctive. The available data, although not numerous, indicate a unique movement, prophetic of the place occupied in modern life by the Scottish peasantry. Even in the fifteenth century foreign visitors were surprised by the independence shown by the country folk and by the vigour with which they resented liberties to which French and Spanish peasants submitted meekly; and, with the improvement of their condition, their tone developed, shaping itself into a principle. To the fanatical and lawless spirit which prompted and pervaded the Peasants' outbreak in central Europe, there was no parallel. In Lyndsay's *Satire of the Three Estates*, Pauper, who is a peasant, appears as ally of Souter Tailor, pleading the same cause and urging the same claim both upon Rex Humanitas and upon John Commonwealth. His sharpest complaint is neither against landlords nor against laws, but against Church courts, teinds and parish priests. Not in satire only but, as a later chapter will show, in historic documents, 'very simple folk,' 'poor manurers of the soil,' defined their claim in sober, almost pedantic terms. They laid hold of the thought, expressed in the *Complaynt of Scotlande*, that each of them was 'ane notable member of ane realm, without whom nobility and clergy could not sustain their state nor their life'; and it was among them that *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis* were sung on harvest field and in alehouse, as the revolution made its way. This was the new constituency to which the Reformers appealed—not the 'rascal multitude,' nor the Edinburgh 'mob,' but the law-abiding and religious labourers, who

[1] There is little exaggeration in Andrew Lang's assertion that, when Beaton, the last great defender of the old system, fell, most of the gentry in Fife approved of the assassination.—*John Knox and the Reformation*, p. 22.

claimed their share in the Scottish polity and whom they addressed as their 'beloved brethren, the commonalty of Scotland.'

These five forces made an important contribution, as the following chapters will show, to the overthrow of medievalism, which was completed and sealed between 1546 and 1567. Most of them were operative in other parts of western Christendom; but it was distinctive of Scotland that they all culminated within a single generation, and that they converged in a crisis which was promoted and directed by religion. The religious revolution was thus in the lines of a national development, which gave it momentum and persuasiveness. It seemed to promote the interests of every class except those whose fortunes were identified with the dilapidated fabric of the Church. With religious watchwords and under a religious leader, Scotland made her entry into the modern world. The nation had a veritable renaissance, but it is impossible, either historically or philosophically, to distinguish between renaissance and reformation.

The clearest and most cogent illustration of the connexion is to be found in the career of George Buchanan, who was not only a patriot and a champion of popular rights, but indisputably a son of the Renaissance. Henry and Robert Stephens on one of their title-pages designated Buchanan as *poetarum nostri saeculi facile princeps*; Dr. Johnson spoke of him as 'a great poetical genius'; Dryden pronounced that he was 'excelled by none of the moderns and few of the ancients'; Sir R. Jebb ranks him 'above every Englishman of his time as a Latinist.' Buchanan was a thorough humanist. Even after the attack upon the Franciscans, which led to his exile,[1] he was no favourer of the reformed doctrine. At Bordeaux and Coimbra he taught under the shelter of the Roman Church; and, when brought before the Inquisition at Lisbon in 1550, he disavowed Protestant beliefs, although acknowledging that he

[1] See vol. i. 446.

had had serious doubts about important Church doctrines.[1] He saved his life by abjuring 'Lutheran heresies,' and, although in the convent-prison to which he was condemned he was mainly occupied in writing his famous translation of the Psalms, his leading interests were not as yet religious. When liberated in 1552 he undertook to 'converse only with good and virtuous persons, to confess frequently' and to live as an orthodox Catholic. For seven years thereafter, while Scotland passed through its religious crisis, he remained in France, detached from Church affairs, while his fame in the world of letters grew. He studied the Bible, however, in search of a solution of the problems by which men's minds were agitated. In his own language, he 'fell into the flame of the Lutheran sect'; and on his return to Scotland in 1561 he 'gave in his name to the Church of the Scots,'[2] by that time finally severed from Rome, and took some part in the administration of its affairs. In no sense a religious partisan, he acted for some years as tutor to Queen Mary in classical literature. Yet he was a keen patriot, and shared the aspirations of the 'new nation' for freedom. Gradually the Renaissance spirit within him was transmuted into the temper of an active reformer, and, after the murder of Darnley, he appeared as an unsparing assailant of the papal party and rendered services to the Reformed Church which secured for him the unqualified praise of its great leader.[3] The minutes of the General Assembly of 1567 record that 'the Assembly, convened in the Nether Tolbooth, named Mr. George Buchanan, principal of

[1] The official records of Buchanan's trial have been published in part by Henriques, Lisbon, 1906. Cf. *The Scottish Review*, xxi. 296-315. They give the impression of an evasive defence, but it is unreasonable to attach great weight to statements extorted from prisoners by the Inquisition.

[2] *Quod tempus maxima ex parte dedit sacrarum literarum studio, ut de controversiis quae tum maiorem hominum partem exercebant exactius diiudicare posset; quae tum domi conquiescere coeperant, Scotis a tyrannide Guisiana liberatis. Eo reversus nomen ecclesiae Scotorum dedit.*'—*Vita Sua* in Irving's *Buchanan* (2nd ed.), p. 326.

[3] 'That notable man by the merciful providence of God . . . remains alive to this day to the glory of God, the great honour of his nation, and the comfort of those that delight in letters and virtue. That singular work of David's Psalms in Latin metre and poesy besides many others can witness the rare graces of God given to that man.'—Knox, *Works*, i. 71.

St. Leonard's College, to be Moderator during their convention.' Under his guidance the Assembly appointed deputies to request 'the Lords of Secret Counsel to agree upon such articles as shall be thought good for the establishing of God's Word, the true religion, and the support of the ministry,' and to urge that 'a perpetual order shall be taken for the liberty of the Kirk of God, and the sustentation of ministers, with a sure union and conjunction among the whole members for the liberty of God's Kirk, whereby we may be able to withstand the rage and violence of our implacable enemies.'[1] Some two years later[2] Buchanan proceeded to prepare a trenchant plea for the revolution in a treatise *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, which for centuries was regarded as highly dangerous by upholders of the divine right of kings and valued as a manual by champions of popular rights whenever religious freedom was at stake.[3] He spent the last years of his life in rescuing St. Andrews University from medievalism, in accordance with principles laid down by Knox, and his pen fell from his hand in 1582 when he had barely completed his *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*—the most favourable presentation possible of the policy of the Reformers.

The name of Buchanan will not recur in the following pages except as an authority for facts, for he was not a pioneer in Church life nor in any important sense a churchman. Yet it will assist the reader to recognize the inseparable connexion between Church history and national development if now and then he recalls the judgment passed and the attitude taken by the man whom foreigners esteemed as the greatest Scotsman of his age. Buchanan knew the intellectual, political and social needs of the new nation

[1] *Booke of the Universall Kirk*, i. 93-5.

[2] The *De Jure*, although published in 1579, was written much earlier, 'possibly before 1570.'—Hume Brown, *George Buchanan*, p. 284.

[3] The *De Jure* was censured by parliament in 1584, and by the Privy Council in 1664; it was publicly burned by the University of Oxford in 1683; Dryden charges Milton with having plagiarized from it in his *Defence of the People of England*; it was retranslated in 1789 and again in 1843, the year of the Disruption, when it was bound up with Samuel Rutherfurd's *Lex Rex.*—*Ibid.*, pp. 269, 270, 284, 292.

better probably than any of his contemporaries; at least, his knowledge was less swayed by bias; and his verdict, that a complete revolution was requisite for national development, was pronounced without reserve after he had witnessed the anarchy and suffering by which the revolution was attended. On his deathbed he was urged by his friends to alter a passage in his *History* which might offend the King and so prevent the publication of the book. '"Tell me, man," sayes he, "giff I have tauld the treuthe!"'[1]

[1] *Autobiography of James Melvill* (Wodrow Society), p. 121.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE OLD FAITH AND THE NEW

1546-1559

Religion on the Continent—Protestantism in England—The churchmen triumph at St. Andrews—English and French invaders—The French marriage and the Catholic menace—Churchmen persecute heresy—Reforming enactments of Privy Council—Adam Wallace—Hamilton's Catechism—Inefficiency of the Bishops—Anarchy in Church life—The *Compendius Tractive*—Martyrdom of Myln—The churchmen arraigned—Last attempts at reform and the 'Twopenny Faith.'

THE thirteen years which passed between the fall of Beaton and the overthrow of the Roman Church in Scotland were momentous for the religion of every European nation, but the course of religious events as it affected the Scottish Church was definite and can be indicated briefly. The breach between Protestants and the adherents of Rome was completed, so far as doctrine was concerned. The Council of Trent suspended its sittings on June 2, 1547, having repudiated and anathematized the dogmas which Protestants regarded as vital; and, although the sittings were resumed for fourteen months on May 1, 1551, there was no abatement of doctrinal rigour nor any indication that an abatement was probable.[1] The Council had indeed passed some wholesome enactments for practical reform, but in the main these were executed in the spirit of Ignatius Loyola, who, when he died in 1556, left the Jesuit Order fully organized and exultant in the missionary triumphs of Francis Xavier (d. 1552). Paul IV (Caraffa), who became

[1] It was not clear until 1552 that Protestants could not take part.

Pope in 1555, set himself with virulent if honest zeal to extirpate the Protestant heresy.

Yet in central Europe this development was checked, and attempts at conciliation were maintained partly through the pacificatory disposition of Melanchthon, partly through the desire of the Emperors to secure the unity of their wide realm. The *Interims*, or temporary adjustments, of Augsburg and Leipzig in 1548 and the Religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555 marked, or registered, the detachment of Lutherans from the militant forces of Protestantism, which for a time changed the centre of the Reformation movement. The alteration was accentuated by the policy of the Emperor Ferdinand I, who in 1556, although 'the most orthodox sovereign in Europe, was forced into war with his spiritual father,'[1] and, still more, by religious debates and developments which appeared among Lutherans. Severe contests were waged among them as to non-essentials (*Adiaphora*) in 1549-55, and as to the co-operation of the will with grace (*Synergism*) in 1556-60, while Luther's teaching about the real presence was hardened into a shape which had all the precision of transubstantiation without the glamour of tradition. In 1552 the Lutherans under Westphal declared that the divine body enters the stomach of communicants, and in 1560 a Synod held at Stuttgart explicitly affirmed the ubiquity of the Lord's body and its manducation in the act of communion. In these controversies the Scottish Reformers took not the slightest share and showed not the slightest interest;[2] but they fall to be recorded here, in explanation of the complete severance of Scotland from the Lutheran Churches. The severance was increased by a radical divergence of view as to the relation between Church and State, with the result that for nearly three centuries there was no communication, not even the contact of

[1] Froude, *History of England*, vi. 26. After 1555 the Augsburg Confession was safe as the legalized religion of portions of the Empire.

[2] Sir James Balfour of Pittendreich, 'the most corrupt man of his age,' is said to have favoured 'Martin's opinion of the Sacrament' and to have refused to communicate with the Scottish Reformers; but Knox denies this. Balfour returned to the Roman Church.—Knox, *Works*, i. 202.

collision. The indebtedness of Scotland to the Lutheran movement for the first planting of the reformed faith had been immeasurable; its evangelistic literature in prose and verse had taken firm root in Scottish soil, and as late as 1559 the Scottish Reformers were styled 'Lutherans' by their opponents; but before that date the Lutheran Churches had entered an orbit from which the Scots were excluded by their political as well as their religious proclivities.

In this period the cause of the Reformation was led by Swiss Protestants, among whom John Calvin had come to hold an unrivalled position. The *Institutes* of Calvin, published in 1536 and amplified in 1539, had furnished Protestants with an adequate statement and defence of their doctrine; before 1555 Calvin, after a hard struggle with secular and anarchical forces, had become master of Geneva and established there, under his *Ecclesiastical Ordinances*,[1] a Church system which, although coming far short of his own ideals, presented a method of administration sufficiently strong to resist Roman aggression and antinomian aberrations. Geneva rapidly became the headquarters of Protestantism and a refuge for exiled Reformers of all nationalities. In the Agreement of Zürich (*Consensus Tigurinus*), reached in 1549 under his guidance, the Reformed communities gained a credal basis for their Church life; and it was to him, and to those who endorsed his positions, that leading Reformers looked for guidance in their respective perplexities. Yet so far as Church organism was concerned, the French rather than the Swiss Protestants gave expression to Calvin's ideas. In spite of the efforts of Henry II (1547-59) to combat the Reformation, the Reformers in France, who, amidst the horrors of the *Chambre Ardente*, had considerable sympathy and some support from the nobility, organized a Church which met for the first time in Synod in 1559, with the *Confessio Gallica* as its creed. The movement was in fact so powerful at that stage, that Francis II on his accession saw reason to fear a revolution.

[1] Calvin's Ordinances were adopted in 1541.—Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, ii. 128.

The rapid alternations which took place in England between 1547 and 1559 are familiar in their general outline to every reader, and it will be enough for our purpose to recall the bare facts. Edward VI, who succeeded his father on January 28, 1547, was for the first two years of his reign under the tutelage of Lord Protector Somerset, who brought Peter Martyr to Oxford and Bucer to Cambridge, in hope of working out a complete reformation. In accordance with the advice of Calvin[1] that compulsion should be used, an Act of Uniformity was passed in 1549, and in the same year it was enacted that images and paintings should be removed from parish churches. In 1550 the altar was removed from St. Paul's, London, and a table placed in its room, while in 1552 a Book of Common Prayer, which had been issued two years earlier, was revised, in accordance with the views of drastic Reformers, a rubric, known as the Black Rubric, being inserted, which defined the Lord's Supper as a memorial celebration and denied 'any real or essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.'[2] These were governmental measures, and in many districts of England they were intensely unpopular; so that when Mary Tudor (1553-8) became queen, her accession, although she was known to be a Romanist, was not unwelcome. It was only when she turned to those ruthless persecutions, which won for her the irrevocable epithet of 'bloody,'[3] that popular feeling swayed round and prepared the nation for the accession of her sister Elizabeth (December 17, 1558), who, if not a decided Protestant, was openly hostile to the papacy and to the celebration of mass. The complication of international affairs[4] gave an almost unparalleled importance to the religious attitude of Elizabeth. Protestantism was making way in France and the Netherlands; negotia-

[1] In a funeral sermon preached after Mary Tudor's death, Bishop White described the Reformers as 'wolves coming out of Geneva.'—Pollard, *Political History of England*, 1547-1603, p. 193.

[2] Forty-two Articles, published in 1553.—*Ibid.*, p. 72.

[3] In Mary's reign, 277 persons were burned as heretics.—Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i. 276, 325, 327.

[4] For a clear summary of political events, see F. W. Maitland in *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 560 ff.

tions for an alliance between France and Spain for the suppression of heresy had been begun in May and, after an interval, resumed in October; and the far-reaching question arose, on which side the new English sovereign would stand; so diverse had been the religious policies of her three predecessors. For two months she seemed to hesitate, but in February 1559 it was clear that she would rule as a Protestant sovereign. At Easter she received communion in both kinds, and this step was sealed, at the end of April, by a renewal of the Act for Uniformity of Religion.[1] Three weeks before the passing of that Act, the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis had united the continental powers in a policy which implied a simultaneous campaign against the Reformation, and initiated those religious wars by which Europe was distraught for half a century. At this crisis an alliance with Scotland gained immeasurable importance for Elizabeth. Her situation would have been almost desperate if the Scots had sided with the Roman Catholic powers, or even allowed the French to make Scotland the basis of an attack upon England. So it is that the political and religious development of Scotland (and even details which in themselves may seem to be trivial) had international importance and exercised a determining influence upon European history.[2]

While those events were in progress, a complete political change was accomplished in Scotland. In 1546 the traditional hostility to England and a desire for alliance with France were dominant; in 1559 these had given way to hatred of France, and the Church party, which relied upon French support, could no longer claim to be champions of national independence. No doubt it is difficult to disentangle the politics of the period from its religion, for the leaders in politics, even if not personally religious men, used religious language and furthered the supposed interests of

[1] The Act authorized the Second Book of Edward VI with some alterations, including the omission of the Black Rubric.—Frere, *History of the English Church*, 1558-1625, p. 28.

[2] 'The Guises, who now came into power, regarded Scotland as the corner-stone of their ambition.'—Pollard, *Political History*, p. 223.

the old faith or of the new. Yet the political development can be outlined clearly enough to set Church affairs in their historical place.

The murderers of David Beaton took refuge in the castle of St. Andrews, where they were joined by the leaders of the English party and by other opponents of Beaton's cause. Within a fortnight of the murder, on June 11, 1546, the Privy Council proclaimed the murderers outlaws and definitely renounced the English alliance;[1] on August 3 they declared formally that it was treason to slay a chancellor of the realm;[2] and on August 21 all lieges were summoned to the siege of St. Andrews. But the proceedings were half-hearted. Although the clergy were keen and promised to contribute £2000 monthly to the cost of the siege, the Regent Arran was backward and actually offered to condone the murder if the castle were surrendered and a papal absolution obtained. Only when the offer was refused, was Norman Leslie, the principal actor in Beaton's slaughter, outlawed by name[3] and the siege taken in hand. In September, the Regent transmitted to the Pope a gloomy account of the condition of Scotland, pleading that the ancient privileges of the Scottish Church should not be abated and explaining the difficulty of avenging Beaton; he appealed for financial assistance, urging that Scotland had always been orthodox and had never before asked for money from Rome.[4] At the same time appeals for military assistance were transmitted to France, while the besieged turned for help to Henry VIII, who, if not a party to the assassination, had stimulated the assassins. Henry both promised assistance and urged the Regent to withdraw from the siege,[5] and on December 21 an 'appointment' was reached that the siege should be raised until an absolution of the assassins should arrive from Rome.[6] The weakness of the papacy at this stage is clearly exhibited by the

[1] *Register of Privy Council*, i. 26, 29. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 34.
[3] Herkless and Hannay, *Archbishops of St. Andrews*, iv. 210.
[4] Theiner, pp. 617, 618; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 59.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 60.
[6] Lang, *History of Scotland*, ii. 4, 20.

facility with which pardon was granted to men who had expressed no penitence for their savage deed. The absolution arrived at St. Andrews before April 2, and it was tossed aside contemptuously by the besieged. Their plea for rejecting it was that it contained the ambiguous phrase, *Remittimus irremissibile*, but 'in quiet they said they had liefer have a boll of wheat nor all the Pope's remissions.'[1] The end of the siege, however, was at hand. On July 21 a fleet of French galleys appeared in the bay, and ten days later the castle was in the hands of the French, who razed it to the ground. The captured garrison were carried off to France, under promise that, if they were 'not content to remain in service and freedom there,' they should be conveyed at the expense of the King of France to any country they pleased except Scotland.[2] In spite of this promise, some were held captive in French castles and the rest sentenced to labour in galleys at Rouen, Cherbourg and Brest.

The fall of St. Andrews, however, brought only a temporary triumph to the Church party. Henry VIII was dead, but Somerset, who, as Earl of Hertford, had again and again laid Scotland waste,[3] pursued the policy of conquest vigorously, and on September 10, 1547, routed the Scots at Pinkie Cleugh. In his campaigns there was a good deal of religious propagandism, attended for a time by some success. 'It will advance the King's interest,' wrote Grey, 'to have two or three preachers in Angus.' Dudley reported that there was 'much desire in Angus and Fife to have a good preacher, Bibles and Testaments and other good English books of Tyndale and Frith's translation.' Efforts were made to circulate a 'Godlie and Golden Booke

[1] *State Papers, Scotland* (1547-1563), No. 10, p. 4. Knox (*Works*, i. 203), whom Hume Brown (*History of Scotland*, ii. 27) follows, gives June 21 as the date of the arrival, but the State Paper quoted above is explicit in stating that it had arrived before April 2.

[2] So Knox, *Works*, i. 205. Lang, with Tytler, considers Knox's statement doubtful, mainly because George Buchanan writes '*incolumitatem modo pacti se dediderunt.*'—*History*, bk. xv. ch. 45. But Buchanan's narrative is cursory, and Lesley, to whom Tytler refers, rather confirms Knox's account.—Lesley, *A Historie of Scotland* (S.T.S.), ii. 295.

[3] See vol. i. 468.

for the concorde of England and Scotland, containing godlie things'; before Pinkie, Glencairn sent to England a list of those 'pledged to assist in putting forth of the Word of God,' and Somerset was informed that, 'if it were not for fear of the great men and the priests, the people would gladly submit to the [English] King.'[1] Yet this was too sanguine. The dictates of patriotism prevailed over such persuasions.[2] At Pinkie 'professors of the evangel' fought side by side with churchmen,[3] and, after the defeat, united with them in an earnest appeal to the French for assistance. The appeal succeeded, and by the treaty of Haddington (July 7, 1548) France agreed to defend Scotland against their 'auld inymeis of Ingland,' on condition that the young Queen should be betrothed to the Dauphin 'for the more perfect union and indissoluble amity of France and Scotland.'[4] Mary was immediately convoyed to France, which was to be her home for thirteen years; over six thousand French auxiliaries were landed at Leith;[5] and the Scots and French were engaged in repelling the English invaders and recovering castles from their grasp until 1550, when by the treaty of Boulogne the English forces were withdrawn.[6]

It was a time of anarchy and distress aggravated by dearth. Robbery and murder were frequent, and the records of the Privy Council show that the authorities were almost in despair.[7] The most permanent damage, however, was that done to religious buildings by the English invaders. In 1547 Wyndham reported gleefully the burning of Balmerino

[1] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 6, 66, 69, 91.

[2] Somerset significantly explained the failure by writing that 'the Scots were afraid of an investigation of their corrupt religion.'—Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, i. 145.

[3] Knox, *Works*, i. 211.

[4] Hay Fleming, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 13.

[5] The force consisted of 4000 Frenchmen, 2000 Landsknechts and 500 Italians.—Teulet, i. 186. In 1550 a large proportion was withdrawn, but garrisons were retained.—Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 36; Lesley (Bann. Club ed.), p. 233.

[6] Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 35; Lang, *History*, ii. 14. Peace between the Scots and the Emperor was concluded on December 15.—Teulet, i. 229, 237, 239-248.

[7] *Register of Privy Council*, i. 59, 60, 94. The Privy Council attempted minute sumptuary legislation, prescribing the number of dishes permissible at meals: archbishops, bishops and earls were allowed eight dishes; lords, abbots, priors and deans six, barons and freeholders four; burgesses and other substantial men three—'but with one kind of meat in every dish.'

abbey,[1] and in the same year Holyrood was stripped of its splendour and the fine church of Annan with the nunnery of Elcho was reduced to ruins, while 1548 saw the spoliation of Newbottle abbey, Haddington church and the churches and friaries of Dundee.[2] No doubt these outrages may be palliated by the fact that in some cases abbeys and churches were used as fortresses and were destroyed by the invaders, not through vandalism but for military reasons, but this plea does not lessen the actual calamity. At the time of the English withdrawal, few of those beautiful fabrics, which had been the glory of medieval Scotland, had escaped scathe.

The prevailing confusion was increased by the lawlessness of the French auxiliaries. As early as 1550 complaints reached the Privy Council that 'divers Frenchmen committed sundry attemptattis (assaults) upon the Queen's lieges,'[3] and popular restiveness under such outrages steadily increased.[4] Meanwhile the barons were irritated by the transfer of political offices to Frenchmen, one of whom, Roubay, became holder of the Great Seal, and another, D'Oyssel, chief minister of state.[5] The adherents of the old régime, on the other hand, were so divided that for a time they ceased to be a 'Church party.' The Hamilton clan, led by the Regent Arran and his brother, the primate of the realm, opposed the Queen-mother, Mary of Lorraine, a princess of remarkable ability, who in 1554 supplanted Arran in the regency and thereafter was supported by several noblemen who favoured the principles of the Reformation. The intrigues and collisions which resulted from this rivalry belong to political history, and the outcome of them alone affected the Church.

[1] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 73.

[2] The facts are collated in Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 338 ff. In 1549 the Provincial Council issued a special order for the rebuilding and repair of '*ecclesiae dirutae et dilapsae.*'—*Statuta*, ii. 158. Cardinal Sermoneta, writing in 1556, ascribes the ruinous plight of churches and monasteries to 'hostile inroads and the avarice and neglect of those placed in charge of them.'—*Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots* (S.H.S.), p. 527.

[3] *Register of Privy Council*, i. 105.

[4] Teulet, i. 190 ff.; Lesley (Bann. Club ed.), pp. 217, 218, 234. Lesley frankly avows that the Regent's policy was to make Scotland 'more subject and bound, yea, a province joined unto France.'

[5] Pollard, *Political History*, 1547-1603, p. 224.

Although Knox compares Mary to an unruly cow saddled by mistake, and says that she 'only waited opportunity to cut the throats of all in whom she suspected any knowledge of God to be,'[1] she had solid reasons for showing tolerance towards the religious reformers. There is no ground for ascribing it to treachery that in 1556 the assassins of Beaton were pardoned and restored to their estates,[2] and that important diplomatic duties were entrusted to men who had openly broken with the Church. Until the close of 1557 the Reformers certainly reckoned upon the Regent's support, and an impartial judgment will ascribe this to her political necessities rather than to insidious duplicity. Yet the dislike of the Scots who supported her to the 'regimen of Scotland by France' became more marked.[3] In 1556 three hundred barons rejected a French scheme of national defence,[4] and in 1557 a council held at Newbottle flatly refused to take part in a campaign against England.[5] Throughout the country dislike for the French soldiery grew into hatred until 'great strife began in Edinburgh between French and Scots.'[6]

In 1558 the rift between French and Scottish interests widened into a chasm. When, on April 24, Mary Stewart was married to the Dauphin, public pledges were given that the liberty of Scotland and the succession of the nearest heir to the throne would be maintained; but three weeks before the wedding the youthful bride—Mary was not yet sixteen—by a secret treaty made over to the King of France the kingdom of Scotland and her contingent right to the throne of England, in the event of her death without issue, declaring the assignation valid, whatever other document she had signed or might sign thereafter.[7] The Scottish commissioners, sent to Paris for the marriage, refused to agree to the regalia being conveyed to France for the coronation, and four or five

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 243, 244. [2] Teulet, i. 216, 217.
[3] Lesley says that until 1557 the nobility 'kept their jealousy secretly within their breasts.'—Bann. Club ed., p. 251.
[4] Lang, *History*, ii. 24. [5] Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 42.
[6] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 315; Hume Brown, *Life of Knox*, i. 277, 320.
[7] Labanoff, *Recueil*, i. 50-56. Mumby, *Elizabeth and Mary Stewart*, p. 33.

of them died on their way home, probably from poison.[1] At the end of November the Regent, by skilful conciliation, secured from the Scottish Estates the crown matrimonial for the Dauphin, and about the same time Mary Stewart, at the instigation of the King of France, quartered the arms of England and Ireland 'upon her vessels and common instruments, as well as upon her tapestry and beds.'[2] All these measures were viewed with keen suspicion in Scotland; and when, at the beginning of 1559, it seemed clear that a league of the Catholic Powers against England was impending,[3] the Regent made it manifest that she would abandon the policy of conciliating her Protestant subjects. But at this very time her predecessor in the regency, Arran, now the Duke of Chatelherault, was holding counsel with Sir Henry Percy as to an alliance between England and Scotland for mutual defence against France.[4] Maitland of Lethington too, dexterous and unscrupulous in his diplomacy, held interviews with Elizabeth and her strong counsellor Cecil, although at this stage Maitland was the Regent's trusted secretary. Maitland was acting a part and evaded matters really crucial, but Percy at his meeting with Chatelherault set the religious question in the front. He proposed an alliance 'for the maintenance of God's Word, seeing God hath sent a true Christian religion among you, as now the same I doubt not shall take effect with us,' and Chatelherault responded that the Scots were equally 'desirous of Christian amity betwixt the two realms.' It is almost startling to read this statement by a well-informed English statesman, that Scotland was already more clearly on the side of the true religion than England,[5] but the accuracy

[1] Mathieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, 1550-1695, i. 48 n.

[2] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 396.

[3] In February a marriage was arranged between Philip of Spain and Elizabeth of France.—*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 566.

[4] Keith, *Affairs*, i. 364 ff.; *State Papers, Foreign* (1558-9), Nos. 262, 316, 350; Russell, *Maitland of Lethington*, p. 32; Pollard, pp. 196, 225; Teulet, i. 285-7. The union was designed to secure independence of England from Spain, and of Scotland from France.—*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 559.

[5] It was not to political causes that the change in Scottish sentiment was due. The treaty between England and Scotland, signed on May 3, was arranged by a papal legate. The vital matter for Scotland was detachment from France.—*Papal Negotiations*, xxvii.

of the statement will appear when we turn from politics to consider the course of religious affairs since Beaton's death.

During those thirteen years the Roman Church had been in possession and nominally in power. The Privy Council, which guided affairs during Arran's regency, was largely composed of prelates. Their somewhat feeble endeavours to avenge Beaton were combined with a crusade against heresy. On March 19, 1547, a Convention of 'prelates and other kirkmen' petitioned the Regent and the Privy Council to enforce the laws against the Lutherans, with whose 'pestilential heresies the land was now infected, and who were now preaching openly, especially against the blessed sacrament of the altar, not only in the far parts of the realm but in the court and presence of their Lordships';[1] and in response the Privy Council promised that, if the names of offenders were transmitted to them, the laws against heresy would be put into force. The same Convention which secured this promise resolved that, in accordance with a decree passed at Trent in the preceding June, every cathedral should have at least one qualified preacher,[2] and at Aberdeen, which as usual was prompt in administration, the preacher was instructed to lecture on theology twice a week, besides preaching monthly in the cathedral and yearly in every parish church belonging to the Chapter.[3] A fortnight later the kirkmen promised the Regent a subsidy of 10,000 pounds Scots, on condition that he would 'make certain articles and acts against the New Testament';[4] and some effect was given to the bargain, for it is recorded that in 1548 an Orcadian was 'obliged to flee into England for fear of burning for the Word of God,' and that in 1549 a certain William Scott was 'driven out of Scotland for the sake of the gospel.'[5]

At this stage the official guidance of the Church passed into the hands of John Hamilton, who, although 'provided' to the primacy in 1547, did not occupy that office until

[1] *Statuta*, I. cxlvi. [2] Bellesheim, ii. 200; Can. Trid., sess. v. c. 1.
[3] *Reg. Episc. Aber.*, ii. 317.
[4] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 62.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 83; Fischer, *Scots in Prussia*, p. 34.

1549.[1] Hamilton (b. 1512), a natural son of the first Earl of Arran, had been appointed to the abbacy of Paisley at the age of fourteen, and, after studying for three years at Paris, had become Keeper of the Seal and Lord of the Treasury under his brother the Regent. Like his brother he had wavered in loyalty to Rome, and, although the time of his wavering soon passed, he continued throughout his discreditable career to subordinate the welfare of the Church to the interests of the Hamilton clan. His licentiousness reached a lower level than Beaton's, his offspring, many of them begotten in adultery, being innumerable.[2] This man not only reconstituted and endowed the college of St. Mary at St. Andrews 'for defending and confirming the Catholic faith,' but initiated his primacy by convening the Provincial Council 'to restore tranquillity and preserve complete unity in the ecclesiastical estate' and to extirpate the 'heresies by which the Lord's flocks were cruelly assailed.' The Council, which met at Linlithgow in August 1549 and continued its sittings at Edinburgh in November,[3] began its proceedings by the solemn affirmation that the strife and heresy which prevailed had two principal causes and roots: 'the corruption of morals and profane obscenity of life in ecclesiastical persons of almost all ranks, and their crass ignorance of good literature and of all arts.'[4] Thereafter it passed sixty-seven enactments regarding the character and duties of the clergy, thirteen of them being verbal repetitions

[1] Hamilton's authority was still checked by the old jealousy of Glasgow. In October 1552 James Beaton, nephew of the Cardinal, who had been consecrated to the see of Glasgow two months before, was 'exempted perpetually' by Papal Bull from the authority of the primate.—*Statuta*, I. cxxiii.; Dowden, *Bishops of Scotland*, p. 350. Until his death in 1603 this Beaton was, as will be seen, very influential.

[2] The evidence will be found in Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 51, 557. It is impossible to plead that his offences were those of youth. In 1561 one of his paramours was banished from Edinburgh as an adulteress.—*Extracts from Burgh Records*, 1557-71, p. 129. The medical evidence of his shocking incontinence is printed in *Statuta*, ii. 301, 302.

[3] The relation between the two meetings is not quite clear. At Edinburgh the resolutions come to at Linlithgow were endorsed.—Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 209; Grub, ii. 33.

[4] At this Council 'the new light was mingled with the old'; two future leaders of the Reformed Church were present, John Wynram and James Stewart, afterwards Regent Moray; John Major was represented by a proctor.—Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 85.

of reforming statutes passed by the Council of Trent. The clergy were enjoined to put away their concubines under penalty of deposition, to dismiss their children from their houses, not to promote their children to benefices,[1] nor to enrich the daughters with dowries, the sons with baronies, from the patrimony of the Church. Prelates were forbidden to keep in their households notorious drunkards, gamblers, public fornicators, night-walkers, blasphemers of God's name or men addicted to detestable swearing. All the clergy were called to amend their lives and manners, to dress modestly, to keep their faces shaven and their heads tonsured, to live with sobriety and restraint, so as to be able to help the poor, to abstain from secular pursuits, specially from trade and agriculture, which withdrew them from the cure of souls. Rules were prescribed for preaching to the people and for teaching divinity, the writings of Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura being commended; for the visitation of monasteries, nunneries and hospitals with a view to restoring the rights of the poor; for recalling fugitive and apostate monks and sending monks to a university; for preventing the ordination of incompetent men, enforcing residence and limiting pluralities; for silencing the hawkers of indulgences and relics; for compelling beneficed men either to discharge their duties in person, or, if this was beyond their power, to provide substitutes whose ministrations they must attend; for registering wills and controlling Church notaries, with special provision for prevailing abuses in Church consistories. Bishops were instructed to make diligent and strict search for heretics, holding inquisitions at least four times a year, and for their guidance a schedule of prevailing heresies was issued. Among the heresies scheduled were—railing against the sacraments, especially the sacrifice of the mass; denying the immortality of the soul, the efficacy of the prayers of the saints and the rewards bestowed on works done in faith and charity; impugning the doctrine of purgatory and the authority of General Councils; disparag-

[1] Hamilton himself appointed his nephew, aged ten, to the abbacy of Paisley.

ing the fasts and feasts appointed by the Church; special search was to be made for books of rhymes and popular songs containing slanders upon churchmen and Church institutions, or any kind of heresy. These excellent admonitions were accompanied by the following appeal:

'The present Convention beseeches, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, and for the kindling of piety exhorts all and each of the bishops . . . to reform their life and morals to better purpose . . . in order that occasions of heresy may be more easily obviated and the said bishops be able with greater freedom and expedition to take measures for their repression, lest the very persons who are themselves implicated in notorious charges (*crimina*) rashly proceed to the rigorous correction of the morals of others, since from this cause arises the greatest scandal to the laity and the largest proportion of the heresy.'[1]

The Council, before closing, agreed to meet in the following August; and, although no meeting was held at that time, the desire to deal with heresy was genuine, for in the autumn of 1550 Hamilton summoned a public convention of all orders of prelates to deal with a certain Adam Wallace, a native of Tarbolton in Ayrshire, whose offences had escaped the vigilance of his diocesan.[2] The convention, which has been described by an eye-witness, was held in the church of the Black Friars, Edinburgh, the Regent and other prominent noblemen being present. The leading charge against Wallace was that he had denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, but he was also accused of having taught in public, and other 'abominable heresies' were alleged, among which Knox names the fact that he had baptized his own child.[3] Although 'a simple man without much learning or Latin,' he was well educated and discreet,

[1] The edicts of the Council are printed in *Statuta*, ii. 81-127, and translated in Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 88-134. Some of them were taken from the Acts of other Councils besides Trent, with additions. Thus, to the statute for the reformation of monasteries a provision for the reformation of nunneries was added—an addition much required in Scotland. See vol. i. 444 and page 36 of this volume.

[2] When applying to Rome for extension of his primatial authority, Hamilton boasted of this.—*Liber. Offic. S. Andree*, p. 167.

[3] *Works*, i. 239. Knox specifies as further charges alleged against Wallace his denial of purgatory and of prayers to the saints and for the dead, and alleges that when under trial he used violent language against the bishops. As in the case of Patrick Hamilton's martyrdom (see vol. i. 424), he transfers his own spirit to the martyr.

having indeed been tutor to the family of Ormiston in succession to Knox. At his belt, according to a custom of the Reformers, he carried a Bible in French, Dutch and English. Under cross-examination he said that he had taught but seldom, at the table and in other private places, when he had been appealed to for religious guidance; but as to transubstantiation he was explicit in declaring the mass to be idolatry and abominable in God's sight, adducing texts to prove that 'the natural body of Christ' is in heaven at God's right hand, and that, since His ascension, the Holy Spirit has been the guide and stay of His people. 'It is a horrible heresy,' exclaimed the best of his judges, Bishop Reid of Orkney. When pressed further with denying the miracle of the sacrament, Wallace declared that he held by the Word, and that he must abide thereby even unto death. For this alone he was condemned,[1] the other charges against him being passed over as secondary. In the interval before his execution attempts were made to persuade him to recant. But, although he gained some comfort from one of those who were sent to argue with him in his cell—'the Dean of Restalrig, a worldly-wise man who had some understanding of the truth—he would consent to nothing that had not evidence in the holy Scripture.' The warder, provoked by his obduracy, spoiled him of his beloved Bible; but he passed the night in singing and lauding God, having learned the psalter of David without book to his consolation. As he was led next morning to the Castle Hill, the common people said, 'God have mercy upon him!' 'And on you too,' said he. Being beside the fire, he lifted up his eyes to heaven twice or thrice, and said to the people, 'Let it not offend you that I suffer this day for the truth's sake; for the disciple is not greater than his Master.' Then was the provost angry that he spake, for he had been forbidden to speak to any man or any to him. Then looked he again to heaven and said, 'They will not let me speak.' The cord being about his neck, the fire was lighted, and so departed he

[1] According to Knox, the Earl of Glencairn protested against the sentence.—*Works*, i. 240, 241.

to God, constantly and with good countenance, in our sight.[1]

Such repressive measures had the support of parliament, which in 1552 prohibited, under penalty of confiscation and banishment, the printing of books concerning the faith, ballads, songs, blasphemies, rhymes against churchmen and tragedies.[2] When the Provincial Council next met in 1552, it could boast that, by the providence of God, the vigilance of princes and the zeal of prelates, the frightful heresies which had run riot for some years had been checked and seemed almost to be quenched.[3] Yet nothing had been accomplished in the way of Church reform. The Council frankly avowed that, owing to 'the difficulty of the time and manifold hindrances,' effect had not been given to the statutes of 1549. Accordingly all statutes passed during Hamilton's primacy were ratified, and sixteen new enactments were passed,[4] making provision for preaching to the people, the instruction of priests and monks and the regulation of hospitals, and specially prohibiting irregular divorce and the alienation of manses and glebe lands. One statute alleges that great neglect of the divine mysteries has prevailed during the last few years, and that in the most populous parishes few deign to attend mass on Sundays and festivals, or to listen when sermons are preached, and instructs that lists of absentees from worship shall be sent to the rural deans. The same statute refers severely to the custom of joking and behaving scandalously in church during service, and 'the playing of games and engaging in

[1] The above is an epitome of Foxe's narrative (*Acts and Monuments*, v. 636-641), which is based upon *Testimonia et literae e Scotia petita, an. 1550.* 'Although Foxe's martyrology has been subjected to minute and searching criticism, the number of his serious errors is comparatively small; it is not so much his facts as his deductions from them and his animus which need to be discounted.'—Pollard, p. 153.

[2] *Acts of Parl.*, ii. 488-9. 'Tragedeis' no doubt refers to Lyndsay's *Tragedie of the Cardinall.*

[3] *Statuta*, ii. 136.

[4] The statutes are printed in *Statuta*, ii. 128-139, and translated in Patrick, *Statutes*, 135-148. By statute 251 provision was made for a parochial registration of banns of marriage and of baptisms, such as had been instituted in England in 1538. The regulations are unimportant, as they were superseded immediately after the Reformation by provisions specified by Robertson in a learned note.—*Statuta*, i. clii, cliii.

profane bargainings in church porches and churchyards' during sermon, and prohibits with heavy fines all trading in the sacred precincts during the sacrifice of mass. The council concluded by recognizing that neither the prelates nor the inferior clergy had as a rule 'attained such proficiency in the knowledge of Scripture as to be able by their own efforts rightly to instruct the people in the Catholic faith and other things necessary to salvation,'[1] and by ordaining that, for their own instruction and the edification of their flocks, there shall be entrusted to rectors, vicars and curates 'a certain book written in the vernacular and after most elaborate revision approved by the most prudent prelates in the realm, and the most learned theologians and other churchmen taking part in the proceedings of the Council. This book shall be called a "Catechism" and shall be printed in name of the Primate and the Provincial Council.'

The manual so sanctioned is a highly interesting document.[2] Although styled Hamilton's Catechism, as published in his primacy and with his authority, it was a composite production in which his occupations, his character and his abilities disqualified him from taking part. A large share in the authorship is ascribed by tradition to John Wynram, a man who deserves attention as a type of a considerable body of churchmen of the time. Wynram (b. 1492) had been attracted by Lutheran teaching in the days of Patrick Hamilton, but had adhered to the Church and had been set in the front by the authorities. He

[1] Foxe illustrates the ignorance of priests and friars by narrating a debate which arose at St. Andrews as to the orthodoxy of addressing the Paternoster to the saints; 'a dangerous schism,' he says, 'followed, which divided the whole people of Scotland.'—*Acts and Monuments*, v. 641-2. Spottiswoode (*History*, i. 180ff.) amplifies the narrative and states that the question was decided by the Provincial Council of 1552. Although a similar controversy certainly took place in England, Switzerland and perhaps in Germany, Foxe's narrative has an improbability which has led high authorities to discredit it.—*Statuta*, ii. 295; Grub, ii. 37; Mitchell, *Hamilton's Catechism*, xxiii, xxiv; Lee, *History*, i. 76.

[2] The Catechism was published at St. Andrews in August 1552. Its character and significance have been misunderstood by several historians, but two excellent editions are now available, the one by Professor A. F. Mitchell (Wm. Paterson, 1882), the other by Dr. T. Graves Law, with an introductory note by W. E. Gladstone (Clarendon Press, 1884). Dr. Law's Preface is a valuable contribution to the history of the period.

became canon at St. Andrews in 1532, and in 1536 was made sub-prior, besides receiving various other appointments. At the trial of Wishart he preached the official sermon, and occupied a prominent place at Wallace's trial. He acted as vicar-general in the interval between Beaton's and Hamilton's primacies; debated questions of theology were repeatedly referred to him as arbiter. Yet he was moving steadily away from the traditional doctrine, and ultimately appeared among those who assisted in drafting the first Confession and the first polity of the Reformed Church. That he had a large share in the preparation of Hamilton's Catechism is more than a conjecture,[1] for the Catechism bears the impress of a mind, or minds, in a process of transition. It is a flowing, devout and occasionally beautiful exposition of the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria, designed to reform and stimulate the moral and religious life of congregations. While minutely practical, it maintains a serious tone of personal piety. The orthodox doctrine of transubstantiation is set forth unequivocally, but the idea of a repetition of the divine sacrifice is discarded, and the necessity for a believing approach to the Lord's board is emphasized with precision. Although the place of images in worship, the complete removal of original sin by baptism, the validity of prayers for the dead, the reality of purgatory and all the seven sacraments of the Church are fully expounded, the exposition has few of the edges which the Council of Trent had given to dogma. The authority of the Church is urged as a source of rest and peace to the ignorant and perplexed, but not a word is said about the prerogatives of Rome, about the Vicar of Christ or the

[1] 'Joannes Wouram vel Wyrem,' according to John Bale, a St. Andrews canon, 'wrote a catechism of the faith in his native tongue.' In an old catalogue of St. Leonard's library the 'Catechism of Wynram' is entered immediately before that of Hamilton. Professor Mitchell conjectures that the former may have been the first draft of the latter. In any case it proves that Wynram was occupied in such authorship. In his posthumous work on *The Scottish Reformation* (p. 287), Dr. Mitchell speaks of John Douglas as taking part with Wynram in the composition of the Catechism; but in the absence of evidence, this too must be regarded as a conjecture. Interesting data are given by M'Crie, *Life of Knox*, p. 416 ff. See also Keith, *Affairs*, i. 5, 6, 149; Hailes, *Annals*, iii. 237-240.

primacy of Peter. Heresy consists in departure from the traditional judgments of the Church as defined by General Councils, with which it lies to define 'all matters concerning the Catholic faith and the good manners of the Christian people.' The powers and jurisdiction of bishops, which belong to them 'specially and principally as successors of the Apostles,' are carefully expounded; but 'other orders and dignities of the Kirk' are passed by, as making not much to edification. Whenever in the course of the treatise Church order and authority are dealt with, they are based on the conciliar doctrine advocated by those who in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries endeavoured to check the increasing claims of the papacy.[1] Equally noteworthy is the Catechism's exposition of Justification by Faith. The teaching of Trent, that justifying faith does not consist in a trust (*fiducia*) by which a man surely believes himself to be justified, is ignored, and saving faith is declared to consist in that assent, with fear, hope, repentance and self-surrender (*assensus et fiducia*) which had become the watchword of Lutherans. Faith so defined 'obtains for us the abundant grace of the Holy Spirit which pours into our hearts the true love of God and of our neighbour.' Some of the phrases used on this topic are taken from *A Necessary Doctrine*[2] and others from Luther's *Larger Catechism*, but there are clearer traces of the influence of the *Enchiridion* of Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne, and other attempts which were being made in Germany to save the unity of the Church by a doctrinal adjustment or compromise.

The Catechism, however, was neither an apologia nor a manifesto, and was singularly free from polemics. It was circulated only among the ignorant clergy, who were instructed to read it in sections, in lieu of sermons, to their congregations 'for the space of half an hour before high

[1] In a note upon Bellesheim (ii. 218), Father Sir D. Hunter Blair argues that the silence of the Catechism as to papal authority has no significance, with the plea that at that time 'no catholic dreamed of disputing the authority of the popes.' Why! it was the question of the hour, frankly and passionately debated at Trent.

[2] Published as a manual by Henry VIII, 1543.

mass, in a loud and audible voice, with attention to the stops, after due preparation, lest by stammering and stumbling they should rouse the ridicule of their hearers.'[1] Copies might be lent to 'some few laymen,' who desired to see it for the sake of instruction rather than from curiosity; there must on no account be any argument about its contents. It was a temporary substitute for preaching, to be used 'till God of His goodness provide a sufficient number of catholic and able preachers, which shall be within few years as we trust in God.'[2] There is no reason to think that it was generally used; no controversialist of the time, on either side, makes the slightest reference to it. Yet for the student of history it has high value, as an indication of the process by which the more earnest of the Scottish clergy, while outwardly adhering to the Roman Church, had forsaken its standing ground and were accepting almost unconsciously the ideas of the Reformers.

During the next six years the Church showed no activity. It was the time of the Marian persecutions in England, but in Scotland persecution was suspended, partly from political causes. Mary of Lorraine had, as we have seen, strong reasons for conciliating all her subjects. She was greatly perplexed by the task she had in hand. Some of her leading political supporters, who were Protestants at heart, became more and more open in their hostility to the Church. She desired, in her own language, 'to lead a new nation to perfection,' and, finding the 'new nation' very suspicious, she passed over discords gently and kept up many pretences.[3] The Primate, whose ill-health compelled him to procure a coadjutor,[4] was suspected both in France and by his suffragans of being half-hearted in his churchmanship, and for several years took no action[5] either towards

[1] *Statuta*, ii. 137. [2] T. Graves Law, *l.c.*, p. 7.

[3] See her letter (Jan. 13, 1557) to the Cardinal of Lorraine.—*Papal Negotiations with Queen Mary*, pp. 425, 430. The dislocation of interests was exhibited in 1556 when, at the request of the King of France, the assassins of Beaton were restored to their offices and properties.—Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 361.

[4] Gavin Hamilton was appointed coadjutor in 1551.

[5] The Provincial statutes of 1552 seem to have been ratified by a Council held in 1555.—*Statuta*, ii. 153.

Church reform or in suppressing heresy. The agencies of the Church being thus left without external stimulus and without leadership, their feebleness and inefficiency became manifest in all directions, nowhere more clearly than in the episcopate. Hamilton's vices were openly alleged as a defensive plea by bishops who were living licentiously,[1] and these, as the list of legitimations shows, were numerous. Patrick Hepburn, bishop of Moray, was probably the most flagrant profligate, but he had several rivals in vice. The dean and the chapter of Aberdeen, when attempting to enforce the statute which enjoined churchmen 'to remove their open concubines,' urged their bishop to dismiss a certain 'gentlewoman' from his company, otherwise 'divers that were pertinacious would not accept correction from one who would not correct himself.'[2] There were indeed two bishops of unquestionable character and ability. David Panter, who was appointed to the bishopric of Ross in 1549, was reputed for his learning, and, as the Regent's Secretary of State, showed himself to be an able and influential diplomatist; but he spent the first seven years of his episcopacy on the Continent, and, although when he died, in 1558, the State lost a valuable servant, there is no indication that he paid any attention to the affairs of his diocese. It was different with Robert Reid, whose endeavours to reform the abbey of Kinloss have already been recorded.[3] Reid, who was an accomplished scholar,[4] was promoted to the bishopric of Orkney in 1541, and at once proceeded to Kirkwall, where he organized the constitution and decorated the fabric of the cathedral of St. Magnus, and throughout an eminent political career—he became president of the College of Justice—maintained an active interest in his see. He was one of the ambassadors who lost their lives through their opposition to French aggressions, having shown himself a steady advocate of

[1] Pitscottie (S.T.S.), ii. 141.
[2] *Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 57, 59.
[3] See vol. i. 410, 442.
[4] A list of the subjects of lectures given to monks in a MS. of Professor Grub proves that Reid was a Renaissance, not a medieval scholar.

peace with England.[1] With his death and Panter's the thin line of high-minded bishops disappeared. In fact the number of bishops of any sort gradually dwindled. In 1559 Ross, Caithness, Sodor, Argyll and Brechin were all vacant, while one versatile man, Alexander Gordon, holding loosely in succession the bishoprics of Glasgow, the Isles and Galloway, with the abbacy of Iona, flitted about the land on political and military business under the designation of archbishop of Athens.[2] As an administrative agency episcopacy was all but extinct.

These circumstances go far to explain the Scottish view of episcopal ordination. Hamilton's Catechism might declare that bishops were the successors of the Apostles, and traditionalists might appeal to early centuries, but in this period it was through the teaching of hard facts that the Scots abandoned the idea that grace comes to the ministers of God through episcopal succession.

Official restraint being thus removed, parochial and monastic Church life was reduced to anarchy.[3] The course of moral and religious deterioration has been traced with sufficient fullness in the preceding volume, and it is enough at this stage to cite a single attestation of the pass which had been reached. For many years 'the superintendence of morals, of doctrine and of the election of prelates in Scotland had been almost wholly neglected'[4] by Rome; but Pope Paul IV, on his accession in 1555, was roused by a petition from the Regent, in the name of the girl Queen, that he would allow a taxation of the clergy, 'who hold the

[1] The innuendo of Knox (*Works*, i. 262, 264), that Reid was avaricious, must not be taken seriously; Knox was so steadily set upon disparaging all churchmen. Reid left a bequest 'for founding a college in the burgh of Edinburgh.' His name was commemorated in 14 'old Reid chambers,' which formed part of the original College buildings.—Grant, *Story of the University of Edinburgh*, i. 166-7.

[2] When Gordon was appointed to Glasgow in 1550, 400 ducats were reserved from the episcopal income for each of two French clerics. In 1551 he received the title of Archbishop of Athens *in partibus*, with the income of the abbey of Inchaffray.—Dowden, *Bishops of Scotland*, p. 349; Bellesheim, ii. 195. In 1553 he became bishop of the Isles.—Grub, ii. 31, 40.

[3] For an account of the extent of the 'appropriation' of parishes by monasteries and cathedral and collegiate churches, see Forbes, *A Treatise of Church Lands and Tithes*, Part I., ch. i., 13-14.

[4] Father Pollen, S.J., in *Papal Negotiations*, xxv.

largest and richest part of the kingdom,' and would at the same time consider certain reports transmitted in cipher concerning them. The Pope was slow to concede the imposition of a tax, and ultimately consented to a levy of one-twentieth, instead of one-fifth which had been named in the petition; but the results of a scrutiny of the reports conducted by three cardinals led the Pope to appoint a Visitor on October 27, 1557, in the following terms:

'It has been made known to us that for certain years back ecclesiastical discipline has been very much relaxed in Scotland, and that the ecclesiastical prelates, both secular and regular and others, rectors of churches, holders of benefices or canonries, and prebends alienate Church property . . . to the Church's loss and in favour of men of power, without observing the solemnities by law required; also, that they neglect the fabric of the said churches, allowing them to fall into ruin and decay from age and ceasing from the restoration and repair of them; moreover, that nuns and other women dedicated to God go beyond the bounds of their monasteries and wander through the houses of the laity and admit suspected persons within their monasteries and presume from day to day to abandon themselves to pleasure and human luxury:[1] that diverse abuses are introduced into those parts and very many crimes, iniquities and scandalous enormities (some of them savouring of heresy) are committed by various persons of either sex, by ecclesiastics also of various orders, both secular and regular, which give offence to the Divine Majesty, bring shame on the Christian religion, and cause loss of souls and scandal to Christ's faithful.'[2]

The bishops themselves recognized the rise of a spirit of protest among the common people (*populare murmur*). At Easter-tide especially 'the rude rabble at least, and indeed every one who had been at church, were scandalized when they saw the eagerness of priests in exacting teinds and other offerings, so that they seemed to be selling the most sacred sacrament.'[3]

[1] The report of the cardinals had been more explicit: 'Sceleratos intra coenobia admittant, sese cum illis incestuose immisceant, sacraria puerperis contaminent, prolem apud se alant, in publicum filiorum grege stipatae prodeant et foeminas amplissimis ecclesiae proventibus [dotatas] nuptui tradant.'—*Papal Negotiations*, p. 526.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 7. For unknown reasons the Visitor did not reach Scotland.

[3] *Statuta*, ii. 174; *Statutes*, p. 185. Bellesheim (ii. 240) speaks of the 'convincing and melancholy testimony to the decay of moral and religious discipline in the Scottish Church and to her urgent need of reform.' The Catholic author of the *Complaynt of Scotland* alleges that 'no statutes, banishing, or burning will bring the schism to an end till the clergy remove their own abuses.'—Lang, *History*, ii. 32.

The alienation of Church properties here censured by the Pope was a cause of confusion and distress to later generations, and it should be carefully noted that the blame lies upon churchmen as much as upon unscrupulous politicians. It is true that many abbeys and priories were appropriated recklessly for the younger sons of the nobility or handed over by the Regent to her French kinsmen,[1] but the monks themselves were responsible for innumerable alienations. Recognizing that the days of monasticism were numbered, they were hindered by no religious scruples from making the best possible provision for their personal interests. The gravest offenders seem to have been the Grey Friars, who in the fifteenth century had been conspicuous for their zeal. The Dundee friars, for example, gave over their lands to the Earl of Crawford in exchange for certain feu-duties, while at St. Andrews, where the landlords began to withhold their annual payments to the friary, a similar transfer was made to the town magistrates. Between 1550 and 1560 five communities of Grey Friars divested themselves of their lands in favour of friendly barons or burghs, on condition that they should be restored when troublous times were over. This 'condition' implied no intention of steadfastness, and indeed was frequently accompanied by that 'apostasy' against which Provincial Councils protested. Thus in 1548 three of the Dumfries friars, when making a bargain about their estates, 'renounced the Bishop of Rome,' and seven years later the remaining friars followed their example.[2]

The paralysis by which the Church was smitten is exhibited in a defensive statement published in 1558 by Quintin Kennedy, commendator of Crossraguell Abbey, under the title *Ane Compendius Tractive*.[3] Kennedy, who was son of the second Earl of Cassillis, was alarmed by the

[1] Mathieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, i. 28; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 313-14; Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 386.

[2] Moir Bryce, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, i. 84, 150, 193, 226, 292-5, etc.

[3] The *Compendius Tractive*, with a Preface by David Laing, is printed in *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. pp. 89-174. The account given of it in Keith's *Affairs* (iii. 405-412) is inadequate.

progress made by 'pestilent preachers who were going about like masterless dogs . . . seeing no authority in the Church,' and thought it intolerable that 'every slave should determine on the greatest secret in all the Scriptures' and should 'swear that the Spirit of God reposed in his breast and swam in his lips.' He recognizes, indeed, the evil plight of the Church and its glaring corruption.

'See we not daily by experience, if a benefice is vacant, the great men of the realm will have it for temporal reward . . . or else they will stir up sedition . . . and when they have got the benefice, if they have a brother or a son—yes, suppose he can neither sing nor say—nourished in vice all his days, he shall at once be mounted on a mule, with a side-gown and a round bonnet, and then it is question whether he or his mule knows best to do his office. Perchance Balaam's ass knew more than both of them! What wonder is it, when such disguised personages are chosen to have Christ's flock in guiding, that the simple people be wicked, as they are indeed, esteeming vice to be virtue and virtue to be vice. . . . Thou mayst see daily a bairn and a babe, to whom scarcely would thou give a fair apple to keep, get perchance five thousand souls to guide; and all for avarice that their parents may get the profit of the benefice. . . . The convent and place where God should be daily honoured and served goes clean to ruin, and they who are the procurers of such monstrous farces in the Kirk of God are the principal criers-out on the vices of Kirkmen. . . . The terrible day shall come when the unhappy avaricious man shall bewail the time that ever he had the brother or son whom he made a guide and ruler of Christ's flock. . . . The poor simple people, so dearly bought by the blood and death of Jesus Christ, miserably perish; the Kirk is slandered; God is dishonoured; all heresies, wickedness and vice reign.'

Yet according to Kennedy it is not the part of those who see these offences to be 'correctors of the same'; they should complain to the higher powers and, in their default, beseech God to 'stir up the hearts of those to whom it appertains by their vocation to be correctors; . . . they should thole (tolerate) the abuse until God provide a remedy by an order. For example, if there be one part of a dyke which is consumed and serves for naught, yet every man who passes by should not cast down the place which he thinks faulty at his pleasure, but should, if his zeal be godly show to the gardener to whom it appertains to correct the fault.' The 'gardeners' are the ministers and rulers of the

Kirk, to whom, 'even if they be vicious,' supreme authority belongs. The *Tractive*, like Hamilton's Catechism, makes no reference of any sort to Rome, pope, archbishops, or even bishops. The Church of God is the Christian Congregation: here, as at many other points, Kennedy accepts the definitions of the continental Reformers, although he rails at them roundly, specially at Calvin, 'than who there has been but few worse in all kinds of wicked opinion in the whole world.' It is only because 'the whole and universal Christian Congregation' can never meet, that God has entrusted authority to 'the Apostles and Seniors and their successors, duly convened in General Councils.' To such Councils, composed of 'the chief pastors of the Congregation,' it belongs to decide all doubtful matters, and to their verdict, whatever their personal character, the individual Christian should submit meekly without curious reasoning. The title of laymen to read Scripture has not been defined by the Kirk, but Kennedy thinks that a man may 'read Scripture temperately so far as to enable him to bear his own burden, accepting the judgment of his pastor in matters above his knowledge.' The one intolerable claim, pregnant with disorder, anarchy and heresy, is a claim of private persons to pass judgment upon the rulers of the Church.

The significance of such arguments is unmistakable. They include no defence of the papal system, nor any palliation of the abuses of that system prevailing in Scotland; they accept without reserve the truth that the Holy Spirit's guidance is promised to the Christian Congregation; and they concentrate attention upon the delegation of that authority to 'rulers' who have a claim to obedience wholly independent of their personal character, while denying flatly the right of the private Christian to do more than seek for his own salvation, within terms prescribed by his rulers, and to pray that God, in an orderly way, would supply better rulers. There could scarcely be a clearer presentation of the sixteenth century Church-problem, stripped of all accidentals, than in this the

last pre-Reformation apologia for the Roman Church. The rights of private Christians to resist depraved Church rulers were unreservedly denied.

It was within a few months of the publication of the *Compendius Tractive* that the Regent resolved to abandon her conciliatory policy.[1] The change was foreshadowed and accompanied by various endeavours to assert Church authority. Hamilton appealed to the Earl of Argyll respectfully but urgently to dismiss John Douglas, a heretical preacher whom he had harboured in his household for some time; and, receiving a vigorous and vituperative refusal,[2] turned upon a less powerful offender. On April 10, Walter Myln, or Mill, an apostate priest, eighty-two years of age, was arrested at Dysart, when he was 'warming himself in a poor woman's house and teaching her and her children the Ten Commandments,' and was arraigned at St. Andrews before a convention of the clergy, including five bishops, four abbots and the reputed author of Hamilton's pacificatory catechism. Twenty years earlier Myln had been driven abroad, by the fury of David Beaton, from a parochial charge at Lunan in Angus and had returned when persecution abated. Either before or after his flight, he had married, and the leading charge against him—Hamilton and Hepburn being among his judges—was that he had broken his vow of celibacy.[3] He was also charged with having dissuaded people from attending church and with having put forth heretical opinions as to the number of the sacraments, the mass and pilgrimages. He was a frail old man, enfeebled

[1] See page 23.

[2] Argyll's reply, probably drafted by Douglas, is printed in Knox, *Works*, i. 281-291.

[3] Knox's critics make much of the fact that in one passage he ascribes the arrest to Hamilton and in another says that it was by 'the counsel of Hepburn alone that Myln was put to death.'—*Works*, i. 307, 300. The discrepancy is removed by Pitscottie's statement that in the course of the trial Hamilton hesitated.—Pitscottie, ii. 134. Several difficulties in the chronology of the years 1557-9 arise from the fact that Knox narrates the events of those years twice. Book ii. of his *Historie*, which was written first, begins with 1558; in book i. he 'summarily touches' some events 'more amply rehearsed' in book ii. The summary and the rehearsal frequently diverge; the MSS. show that he sometimes hesitated as to the points at which particulars and documents should be inserted; see *Works*, i. 4, 291, 294, 307, with Laing's relative notes.

by travel and ill-treatment, and when taken to the metropolitan church could not climb the pulpit stairs without assistance; but his replies to his accusers were made in a ringing voice which 'rejoiced the Christians who were present and confounded his judges.' He stated that he had 'married a poor woman, to be marrow to him and help him.' Although this was more scriptural than to 'traffic with other men's wives and daughters,' yet knowing, he said, that for a priest it was contrary to Church law, he had 'kept himself quiet'; it was only because he had been constrained by conscience to reprove blasphemers that he had been arrested. In private houses, in the fields, and also when sailing in a ship, he had given religious counsel, but he had never gone beyond the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed and the need for personal salvation. There were only two sacraments for which he cared—the bishops might divide the other five among them, paying special heed to the sacrament of marriage, for bishops who failed to live as St. Paul enjoined Timothy to live were not real bishops. Faith was needed for participation in the sacrifice which had been offered by Christ once for all and needs not repetition. When urged to recant, he said, 'I am corn; I am no chaff; I will not be blown away with the wind nor burst with the flail, but I will abide both.' The court condemned him; but the St. Andrews provost, when called to execute the sentence, declined 'to meddle with a servant of God who preached the Word.' The ugly task was entrusted to the Archbishop's secretary, but other difficulties arose. The merchants of the town hid their stores of gunpowder and rope 'for love they bore to the servant of God.' When at last tied to the stake, the martyr said, 'As for me, it makis not mekill, for I am four score years past and by nature have not long to live; but, if I be burned, there shall a hundred rise from my ashes better than I and shall scatter the proud pack of you hypocrites who perturb the servants of God, and which of you who think yourselves highest shall not deserve a death such as I now die? I trust to God to His pleasure, and that I shall be the hindmost

that shall suffer for this cause.' Then they pulled the tow and let him fall in the fire, and so he burned. During the following night the townspeople erected a heap of stones in his memory, and, although the priests removed the stones in the morning with threats of episcopal cursing, they were replaced,[1] for by this time 'began the people plainly to damn such unjust cruelty.'[2]

It was not only at St. Andrews that these proceedings roused indignation. A remonstrance was lodged with the Regent,[3] who disavowed responsibility and professed to be displeased with the cruelty of the bishops. As the summer advanced another attempt was made to suppress heresy, several 'heretics' being called before the Regent and the bishops to answer for their 'slanders anent the sacraments, the authority of the Kirk and other articles of the catholic religion';[4] but the tide of public opinion had now changed, and on September 1 the accused were rescued and their accusers scattered by an angry crowd of Edinburgh citizens.[5] Another futile attempt to deal with the 'heretics' was made in November,[6] but at the close of the year a verdict was pronounced upon the churchmen by two unexpected judges. Certain 'temporal lords and barons,' who had no share in the prevailing 'heresies' and were attached to the institutions of the Church, especially the mass, presented to the Regent a memorial, representing that the enactments of James V

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 308 n.

[2] The above narrative is taken from full accounts of the trial given by Foxe and Pitscottie, supplemented by Knox and George Buchanan. There is no room for questioning its accuracy. We have omitted particulars which Bellesheim and Keith think doubtful.—*Acts and Monuments*, v. 644-7; Pitscottie, ii. 130-6; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 156-8; Knox, *Works*, i. 308; Buchanan, *History*, book xvi. c. 19; Bellesheim, ii. 235-6; Grub, ii. 52; Lang, *History*, ii. 42. The date of the martyrdom was April 28, 1558.

[3] This was immediately after the martyrdom and is not to be confused with a more sweeping remonstrance, lodged in November, which will be described in next chapter.

[4] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 382; Pitscottie, ii. 137.

[5] The proceedings will be narrated in the following chapter.

[6] According to *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland* (*Wodrow Miscellany*, p. 55), Hamilton (in the end of December) ordered the preachers to appear before him at St. Andrews on February 2, but the Queen, fearing uproar, bade him delay the matter; Pitscottie, ii. 138, gives November 8 as the date. Lang (*Knox*, pp. 87, 91) ignores Pitscottie, and says that the narrative of Knox is 'dislocated.' M'Crie follows *A Historie*, in the *Life of Knox*, p. 152.

against 'the ungodly and dissolute lives of bishops and clergy' and the statutes of recent Provincial Councils had borne little or no fruit, indeed that 'the Spiritual Estate had rather deteriorated,' defying 'such persuasions as had hitherto been used.' They urged that, in order to check 'open and manifest sins and notorious offences,' the secular authority should enact as follows:

'That there be sermon in every parish church on all Sundays and holy days, or at least on Christmas day, Easter day, Whitsunday and every third or fourth Sunday: That no one be allowed to preach without due examination of his doctrine, life and learning: That no curate or vicar should in future be appointed unless he were qualified to read the Catechism[1] plainly and distinctly: that the meaning of the sacraments be explained before celebration: That Common Prayers with Litany in the vernacular be said after mass and Evening Prayers in the afternoon: That death-dues, church-dues and Easter offerings be made voluntary, so that none be debarred from the sacraments by poverty: That the procedure in bishops' courts be shortened and their costs reduced: That in accordance with the Act of 1493[2] appeals to Rome regarding benefices be prohibited.'

The lords and barons showed that they were no revolutionists by urging at the close of their memorial:

'That no one be allowed to dishonour the divine service of the mass, or to speak irreverently thereof: That no one should allow the sacraments to be administered except by persons duly ordained: That no one should dare to burn, spoil or destroy churches, chapels, religious houses or their ornaments, or to make innovations in the beloved ceremonies and rites of Holy Kirk, and that no change be made in them except by the magistrate and authorized churchmen.'[3]

The Regent complied partially with the petition by an edict published early in the following year,[4] and the memorial was transmitted by her to the two archbishops, with instructions to convene the Provincial Council; but, before the Council met, a more startling manifesto appeared. In the sixteenth century the practice of intimating a revolt

[1] Hamilton's Catechism. Manifestly the injunction that priests should practise themselves in reading the Catechism had been ineffective.

[2] See vol. i. 351-4.

[3] The memorial is printed in *Statuta*, ii. 146-151, and Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 150-160; Lesley gives a loose abstract (Bann. Club. ed., p. 270).

[4] On February 9, 1559.—*Statuta*, i. clvii. n. 3.

by affixing placards or bills to public buildings by night was not unusual on the Continent,[1] and now it reached Scotland. On the morning of January 1, 1559, the following placard, known as 'the Beggars' Summons' or Warning, appeared on the gates of all friaries:

'THE BLIND, CROOKED, BED-RIDDEN, WIDOWS, ORPHANS AND ALL OTHER POOR, SO USED BY THE HAND OF GOD THAT THEY CANNOT WORK, TO THE FLOCKS OF ALL FRIARS WITHIN THIS REALM, WE MAKE CLAIM FOR RESTITUTION OF WRONGS BY-PAST AND REFORMATION IN TIME COMING.

'Ye yourselves are not ignorant and, though ye would be, it is now, thanks to God, known to the whole world by His infallible Word, that the benignity or alms of all Christian people pertains to us alone; which ye, being sound of body, strong, sturdy and able to work, have falsely stolen from us to our great torment alas! . . . partly under pretence of poverty, although ye possess all abundance, partly through cloaked and hooded simplicity, although your proudness is known, and partly by feigned holiness which now is declared to be superstition and idolatry. Also, by your false doctrine and wresting of God's Word learned of your father Satan, ye have induced the whole people, high and low, to believe that to clothe, feed and nourish you is the only acceptable alms allowed before God, and that one penny or one piece of bread once in the week is enough for us. Even so ye have persuaded them to build for you great hospitals and to maintain you therein by their purse, which pertains by all law to us alone as having been built and gifted for the poor, among whom ye cannot be reckoned by any law proceeding from nature, reason or civil policy.

'Wherefore, seeing our number is so great, so indigent, and so heavily oppressed by your false means, that none take care of our misery and that it is better . . . to face you in plain controversy than to see you hereafter, as ye have done before, steal from us our lodgings, while we perish and die for want of the same: We have thought good, before we enter into conflict with you, to warn you by this public writing, fastened on your gates where ye now dwell, that ye remove furth of our said hospitals betwixt this and the Feast of Whitsunday next; so that we, the only lawful proprietors thereof, may enter thereto and afterwards enjoy these commodities of the Kirk which ye have hereunto wrongfully holden from us; certifying you that, if ye fail, we will at the said term in whole number (with the help of God and the assistance of His saints on earth, of whose ready support we doubt not) enter and take possession

[1] Thus at Geneva, on June 9, 1532, after the publication of an indulgence by Pope Clement VII, the doors of all churches were placarded with an offer of free pardon conditioned only by repentance and faith; and on October 18, 1534, the citizens of Paris found the walls of the main streets placarded with bills denouncing the mass.—Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, ii. 64, 145.

of our said patrimony and eject you utterly furth of the same. Let him "therefore that before has stolen steal no more, but rather let him work with his hands, that he may be helpful to the poor."

'*From the whole cities, towns and villages of Scotland.*'[1]

Five months later it became clear that the challenge was no empty threat, but this was understood at once by the friars, for the Conventual Franciscans, eighty in number, abandoned their friaries and migrated to the Netherlands.[2]

It was an ominous winter for churchmen. Lesley tells how monstrous fish, such as the Scots of ancient days had never seen, rose from the Forth and crept upon the coast; hailstones greater than 'dow (pigeons') eggs' fell upon many provinces from the high heaven and destroyed all plants. In Lothian and Merse and other places a dragon of marvellous greatness flew over the earth, spouting fire far and wide, so that the people were compelled to watch their barns that they might quench the fire which the dragon spouted forth.[3] When the Council met on March 1, its proceedings lacked interest, the Regent having by this time taken the guidance of Church affairs into her own hands. There was a meagre attendance, which the archbishops attempted to increase by fulminating edicts against absentees; and the panic of the churchmen present was manifest. 'Exceeding great and nefarious seditions,' wrote Hamilton, 'prevailed among the people, who were going utterly astray from the true faith. . . . Lutheranism, Calvinism, and many other wicked heresies were being propagated everywhere and subverting the liberties, rights and privileges of the Holy Kirk of Scotland.' The proceedings began with the appointment of a special commission to enforce the law against concubinage upon the two archbishops, who, the decree states, were perhaps too freely indulgent to themselves in virtue of their privileges and exemptions, while laying grievous burdens on their reverend suffragans and the lower clergy. It is needless to recount the statutes

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 320-1. In the above version a few sentences have been simplified and a few clauses omitted.

[2] *The Scottish Grey Friars*, i. 159, ii. 194.

[3] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 388.

which were passed [1]—thirty-three in number—because most of them were repetitions of the statutes of 1549, and none of them were operative; [2] but the treatment given to the barons' memorial is noteworthy, as an indication of the extent to which the idea of reform was favoured. The Council avowed that they had no power to concede the use of the vernacular in public prayer, although they generously left it to 'every man's discretion to use his private prayers in what tongue pleased him best.' As to appointments to benefices, they said that, although they would be glad if elections were made according to Canon law, they must remit the matter to the Regent and her Council, since 'to the princes principally pertained the nomination of prelates'; nor could they improve upon the existing rules as to the qualifications of priests for preaching. In response to the petition that the meaning of the sacraments should be explained before celebration, they agreed to issue 'Ane Godlie Exhortation,' [3] in which a bald and harsh assertion of transubstantiation was combined with a statement of the ethical and spiritual requisites for true participation in Christ's mystical body which the most suspicious Calvinist might gladly have accepted. Thereafter they enacted that preachers must conform to Church doctrine with regard to fasting, veneration of the saints, purgatory and the efficacy of masses for the dead. Before separating,[4] they

[1] The statutes are printed in *Statuta*, ii. 153-176, and translated in Patrick, *Statutes*, 163-190.

[2] Lesley says that the statutes were so vigorously enforced that many beneficed men joined the Reformers, 'fearing themselves to be put at.'—Bann. Club ed., p. 271; S.T.S., ii. 399. This, however, is an apologia for the old Church and is at variance with facts.

[3] Printed, with Preface by A. F. Mitchell, at the close of *Hamilton's Catechism*; also in *Statuta*, ii. 177, and Knox, *Works*, vi. 676. Spottiswoode and others have confused it with Hamilton's Catechism.

[4] M'Crie, Grub and Bellesheim erroneously suppose that the Provincial Council also debated and answered the claim which the Reformers had presented to the Regent. The error arises from the fact that Lesley gives two accounts of the proceedings. In his earlier account, written 1561, followed in the above narrative, there is no reference to a memorial from the Reformers. The later narrative, published at Rome in 1578 in Latin, and translated by Father Dalrymple in 1596, represents the memorial as coming from Protestants; it is a laboured apologia for the old Church, and introduces references to the Pope and the Council of Trent which do not occur in his earlier narrative, while it omits mention of concessions made by the Council and of the fact that loyal churchmen

made a payment to the Regent, 'on condition that she would maintain them in their dignity.'[1]

Bishop Lesley, who himself gravely required 'reformation in morals,' alleges that many of the clergy were so alarmed by the severity of the statutes that they 'assisted in the overthrow of the catholic religion';[2] but there is no trace of any endeavour to make the statutes operative.[3] The general estimate of the Council is shown in the title by which its 'Godlie Exhortatioun' became known,—'The Twopenny Faith.'[4] The statutes were issued on April 10, but the sittings were continued for three weeks. On May 1, according to a contemporary writer, 'the Council being well set down in the Blackfriars of Edinburgh, one ran in and assured them that John Knox, who was new come out of France, had been all that night in the town: at the which news they being all astonished rose suddenly from the board where they sat and passed forth to the yard, being altogether abashed and fearing the thing which came suddenly to pass; so cast down were they that they never met again to this day.'[5]

It was three hundred and twenty-seven years before another Council claiming to represent the Roman Church met in Scotland.[6] It is true that for a decade the Church party resisted with occasional success the endeavours of the

made a demand for reform. In neither narrative is it suggested that there were two memorials. Cf. Bann. Club ed., p. 270, with S.T.S. ed., ii. 397. *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland* (p. 53) states that the Regent handed to Hamilton a memorial presented by the Protestants in July, and George Buchanan (*History*, bk. xvi. ch. 23) represents Erskine of Dun as appearing before the Council, but at this point Buchanan's narrative is very loose. There is no other ground for supposing that the Council dealt with Protestant claims.—*Statuta*, ii. 300; Grub, ii. 56; Bellesheim, ii. 240, 242; M'Crie, *Knox*, 153. Hume Brown recognizes the significant difference between Lesley's two narratives.—*Life of Knox*, i. 343; *Cambridge History of Literature*, iii. 155.

[1] Knox (*Works*, i. 307) says that 'some say the payment was 40,000 poundes': in *A Historie* (p. 56) it is said to have been 'within 15,000 poundes.'

[2] Lesley (Bann. Club ed.), p. 271.

[3] 'It is open to doubt,' writes the Roman Catholic historian, 'whether those measures could ever have been put into execution. . . . However wise and salutary they were, it seemed as if they came too late to stem the rising flood.'—Bellesheim, ii. 251, 252.

[4] So called because pedlars sold it for twopence. Buchanan (*History*, bk. xvi. ch. 23) says that it was sometimes called 'The Three-farthing Faith' (*triobolaris*), and copies were affixed to all the church doors.

[5] *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland*, p. 56. [6] Bellesheim, ii. 251.

Reformers to reorganize and revive Ecclesia Scoticana, and that they had considerable assistance from the Pope; but their motive and their methods were entirely political and they made no claim to be a religious corporation. The Church life of Romanism was extinct, not through external assaults, but by spiritual atrophy and moral decay. When we turn to trace the growth of Protestantism we shall be considering a movement to which there was no serious resistance on religious grounds. The next devoted Romanists who appeared in Scotland were missionaries labouring *in partibus infidelium*, not successors of pre-Reformation Romanists.[1]

[1] When in 1563 the sessions of the Council of Trent were resumed, Queen Mary explained that she could send no delegates; some of the Scottish bishops who were in France might attend, but the others were occupied in advising her and protecting her life. The apology was presented by a French cardinal.—Patrick, *Statutes*, 221-2.

CHAPTER XXV

PROGRESS OF REFORMATION

1546–1559

Knox at St. Andrews—His early eminence and his preaching—His life in exile—Spread of Protestantism—The work of the preachers—Religion of the gentry—Knox in England—His contentions and their influence—Switzerland and Frankfort—Visit to Scotland—Guidance of the Reformers—'The face of a Kirk'—Origin of the eldership—Manifestations of reforming spirit and the First Covenant—The Congregation and the Lords—*The First Blast* and the *Appellation*—The Regent and the preachers—'The battle approacheth'—Return of Knox.

THE company which gathered at St. Andrews was a mixed one, representing the various forces which were opposed to the régime of the Church. Besides the men who had taken part in the slaughter of Beaton, there were some reckless adventurers 'of corrupt life,' and matured patriots, like Sir David Lyndsay, who had gradually come over to the party of reformation; but the convinced adherents of the new faith were dominant, and public worship, with daily exposition of Scripture, was from the first a prominent feature of garrison life. It was conducted by John Rough, a friar who had acted as chaplain to the Regent Arran at the stage when the latter favoured the Reformers, and who, although sincere [1] and popular, proved unfit for the position which he now occupied. There was free communication between castle and city, and in the parish church the old system was defended by the theologians of the university and friary,

[1] Rough gave proof of his steadfastness ten years later in the Smithfield flames. —Knox, *Works*, i. 187 n.

with whose arguments Rough deemed himself unable to cope. But on April 10, eight days after the garrison had spurned the Pope's ambiguous absolution,[1] the balance of parties was completely changed by the arrival of the man who was destined to give shape and permanence to the Scottish Reformation, and who even at this stage gave immediate proof of his extraordinary powers. John Knox belonged to the social class which in that generation rose into freedom and influence. Born about 1515[2] near Haddington, he was in his own words 'a man of base estate and condition' and by 'nature churlish'; he had received a university education and had been ordained to the priesthood at the canonical age of twenty-five.[3] Although his interests were exclusively religious, he never, as far as is known, held a cure of souls,[4] but found occupation as an apostolical notary and as tutor to families which inclined towards the reforming party. An admiring adherent of George Wishart, whose dangers he had attempted to share,[5] he had after Wishart's martyrdom been forced to escape from Longniddry:

'Wearied of removing from place to place by reason of the persecution that came upon him by the Bishop of St. Andrews, he was determined to leave Scotland and to visit the schools of Germany. (Of England then he had no pleasure, because, although the Pope's name was suppressed, his laws and corruptions remained in full vigour.) But because he had the care of some gentlemen's children, whom for certain years he had nourished in godliness, their fathers solicited him to go to St. Andrews, that himself might have the benefit of the castle and their

[1] See page 19.

[2] In histories written before the Quatercentenary celebrations of 1905, Knox's birth is almost always dated as 1505, but the careful investigations of Dr. Hay Fleming have proved that he was born not earlier than 1513, probably in 1515.—Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, ii. 285.

[3] Fanciful accounts of Knox's youth and early manhood, based upon Beza's *Icones*, appear in his early biographies; they include the statement accepted by M'Crie and favoured by Hill Burton that he was deposed from the priesthood. But documents published in 1862 discredit such statements. His life prior to 1540 is a blank. In that year he was a notary, and as late as 1543 he was both '*Sanctiandreae dioceseos notarius*' and '*sacri altaris minister*.'—Hume Brown, *John Knox*, i. 58. Even the university at which he studied is uncertain.

[4] Hume Brown thinks that Knox was 'probably' tutor at Samuelston, near Haddington, from 1540 to 1543, and 'supposes' that, since there was a small chapel there, he officiated as chaplain.—*Ibid.*, i. 58, 59.

[5] See vol. i. 477.

children the benefit of his doctrine ; and so came he, at the time aforesaid to the said place and . . . began to exercise the children after his accustomed manner. Besides their grammar and other humane authors he read unto them a catechism, account whereof he caused them to give publicly in the parish church of St. Andrews. He read, moreover, unto them the Evangel of John, proceeding where he had left off at Longniddry, and that lecture he gave in the chapel within the castle at a certain hour. They of the place, but especially Master Henry Balnavis and John Rough, preacher, perceiving the manner of his doctrine, began earnestly to travail with him, that he would take the preaching place upon him. But he utterly refused, alleging that he would not run where God had not called him, meaning that he would do nothing without a lawful vocation.'[1]

The proceedings that followed are carefully detailed by Knox, who regarded it as important[2] to show that he was reluctant to undertake the office of preacher, to him the weightiest of all offices. After taking counsel with Sir David Lyndsay, Rough, when Knox was present, preached a sermon upon the election of ministers, giving proof that congregations were entitled to appoint ministers in whom they saw 'the gifts of God,' and, turning upon Knox, warned him of the danger of refusing a vocation to promote 'the glory of God, the increase of Christ's kingdom, and the edification of his brethren.' In closing, Rough appealed to the congregation :

'Was not this your charge to me? And do ye not approve of this vocation? They answered, It was, and we approve. Whereat the said John, abashed, burst forth in most abundant tears and withdrew himself to his chamber. His countenance and behaviour, from that day till the day that he was compelled to present himself in the public place of preaching, did sufficiently declare the grief and trouble of his heart; for no man saw any sign of mirth in him, neither had he pleasure to accompany any man, many days together.'[3]

Although now convinced of his duty, he still shrank from preaching, and thought it enough to furnish arguments in writing for a keen controversy in which Rough was involved in the parish church with the Principal of

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 185-6.

[2] In writing his *History*, Knox shows a master's craft in avoiding details which do not illuminate his narrative. It is from his private correspondence, as a rule, that biographical particulars must be gathered.

[3] Knox, *Works*, i. 187-8.

St. Leonards; but when the controversy culminated in an offer from Rough, speaking in Knox's name,[1] to prove the degeneracy of the Roman Church, the congregation demanded that the proof should be given orally, and on the following Sunday Knox delivered his first sermon. The impression made upon the hearers varied. Some thought that the preacher had incurred the doom of Wishart; some recognized that the time for defending the Church by fire had passed. Some said, 'Others sned [pruned] the branches of the papistry, but he strikes at the root to destroy the whole.' At the instigation of Hamilton, who had been appointed, but not yet consecrated, to the see of St. Andrews, the Vicar-General, Wynram, summoned Knox and Rough to a convention, where they were called to account for nine dogmas which they had set forth:—

1. No mortal man can be head of the Church.
2. The Pope is an antichrist, and so is not a member of Christ's mystical body.
3. Man may neither make nor devise a religion acceptable to God, but is bound to observe and keep the religion received from God, without chopping or changing thereof.
4. The sacraments of the New Testament ought to be ministered as they were instituted by Christ and practised by His Apostles; nothing ought to be added unto them: nothing ought to be diminished from them.
5. The mass is abominable idolatry, blasphemous to the death of Christ, and a profanation of the Lord's Supper.
6. There is no purgatory, in which the souls of men can either be pained or purged after this life; but heaven remains for the faithful and hell for the reprobate and unthankful.
7. Praying for the dead is vain, and praying to the dead is idolatry.
8. There are no bishops unless they preach even by themselves without any substitute.
9. The teinds by God's law do not appertain of necessity to the kirkmen.

Each of these dogmas should be carefully noted as representing opinions which, with very slight variations, Knox maintained till his death, and which indeed he

[1] This seems to be the most reasonable explanation of Knox's narrative. It is just possible that he took part in the debate *viva voce*, although he writes as if his sermon on the following Sunday had been his first public utterance.

impressed upon Ecclesia Scoticana. The Vicar-General, who himself was passing over from the position stated in Hamilton's Catechism to the new theology, proved unable to face Knox, and a Franciscan to whom he handed on the argument failed even more completely, allowing himself to be driven into the statement that the Apostles were inspired 'not when they wrote their Epistles but when they ordained ceremonies.' Thwarted in argument, the Church party made arrangements which excluded Knox from preaching in the parish church on Sundays, but by week-day sermons, probably preached in the chapel of the castle, he so well maintained his ground that many of the towns-people joined the garrison in celebrating Communion in the Reformed fashion.

This, however, was but a temporary triumph. When the castle fell, Knox was one of those who were carried captive to France to spend nineteen months in the galleys,[1] the prisoners of higher rank being imprisoned in castles. To the sufferings of those months he referred only once afterwards, speaking of the 'torments he sustained and the sobs of his heart.'[2] Indeed his mastery when in this pitiful plight was wonderful. Attempts were made to force the prisoners to take part in what they regarded as idolatry. Once, at Nantes, when they refused to adore the Virgin, an image of her was thrust into the face of 'one of the Scottish men then chained,' who, 'seeing the extremity,' cast it into the river, saying, '"Let our Lady now save herself; she is light enough; let her learn to swim." After that, was no Scottish man urged with that idolatry.'[3] Besides upholding his neighbours in the galleys in such stout resistance, Knox gave sound counsel to prisoners of higher rank. When Kirkaldy of Grange, imprisoned at Cherbourg, consulted him, he advised that escape from prison was legitimate provided that there was no bloodshed; but his guidance of another prisoner deserves closer attention. Henry Balnavis, a Scot of social distinction, educated in Flanders and Germany, had reached the dignity of a Lord of Session

[1] See page 19. [2] *Knox, Works*, i. 349. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 227.

in 1538 and acted as Secretary of State under Arran. An adherent of the 'English party,' he had received money from Henry VIII, had been one of those who planned the attack upon Beaton, and at St. Andrews had joined Rough and Lyndsay in urging Knox to preach. While a politician whose contrivances may well be censured, he was a deeply religious man; and in his imprisonment he composed and submitted to Knox an extremely able treatise on 'Justification by Faith,' including in it a competent discussion of such topics as the apostolical rights claimed by bishops and the title of princes to control the religion of their subjects.[1] His definitions and conclusions are all worthy of the attention of close students of the times, but his treatment of Justification[2] appeared to Knox the most important part of the treatise for the Reformers in Scotland, and he despatched it to them with a brief abstract, as 'a most profitable treatise,' showing 'how the troubled man should seek refuge at his God, thereto led by faith.' That a man like Balnavis should have occupied himself when so situated in writing such a work is sufficient to prove the superficiality of the contention that Reformers of his class had no personal interest in religious questions, while the fact that this was the comfort and guidance which Knox attempted to give his countrymen in his absence discloses his conviction that the foundation and bulwark of the Reformation must stand in the acceptance and maintenance of the Reformed doctrine.[3] He had no other communication with them for six years. The thought of Scotland was always with him. On one

[1] Balnavis ascribes to princes the duty of 'restoring the true, pure and sincere Christian religion and abolishing, destroying and putting down all false worship and superstition.'—Knox, *Works*, iii. 528.

[2] 'The substance of Justification is to cleave and stick fast by our God, knowing Him our Maker and Creator, and to believe firmly and undoubtedly that we are not righteous nor just of ourselves nor yet by our works, which are less than we, but by the help of the only-begotten Son of God, who has delivered and redeemed us from death, the devil and sin, and has given us eternal life . . . At every time and hour the said Article is to be driven and inculcate in the ears of the faithful as it were a trumpet.'

[3] The treatise is printed in Knox, *Works*, iii. 431-542. How far it was circulated in Scotland is uncertain; Knox says that it was 'suppressed.'—*Works*, i. 227. It was republished in 1584 from a copy found by a child in the garden of Ormiston, the home of one of Knox's 'bairns.' The treatise had reached his early patrons at least.

voyage which the galley took, it reached the coast between Dundee and St. Andrews. He was in extreme weakness at the time, likely it seemed to die, and a Scot, perhaps meaning to cheer him, asked if he knew the coast. 'Yes,' he replied, 'I know it well; for I see the steeple of that place where God first in public opened my mouth to His glory, and I am fully persuaded, weak as I now appear, that I shall not depart this life till that my tongue shall glorify His godly name in the same place.' Yet when he was liberated in 1549, it was in England that he found a home, with occupations so strenuous that he seemed to forget his native land.

Meanwhile, however, the Reformed doctrine made way rapidly in Scotland. Between 1547 and 1549 there was some deliberate propagandism by the English invaders,[1] 'cartloads' of Bibles being imported into Fife and Angus; and, although such influences were checked by hostility to the invaders, yet, when in 1550 the English troops were withdrawn, the progress of Protestantism became rapid.[2] It was manifestly appealing by its own strength to classes which in England clung to the old Church and resented the reforms dictated by Government. This contrast is clearly set forth in a letter written to Randolph by a Protestant visitor in May 1551:

'There appears to be great firmness and no little religion among the people; but in the chiefs one can see little else than cruelty and ignorance, for they resist and oppose the truth in every possible way. . . . Greater numbers of the commonalty are rightly persuaded as to true religion than among us in England. This seems to be a strange state of things, that among the English the ruling powers are virtuous and godly (*i.e.*, Protestant), but the people have for a long time been most contumacious (*i.e.*, opposed to Protestantism); while in Scotland, on the contrary, the rulers are most ferocious, but the nation at large is virtuous and exceedingly well disposed towards our most holy religion.'[3]

One of the most effective agencies was the ballad literature

[1] See page 19.

[2] Attempts at 'forcible conversion' continued till 1551. 'Dorset is gone into Scotland with 300 cavalry and some good preachers, principally to instruct and enlighten in religion that part of the country which has been subdued during the last few years.'—John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, *Original Letters* (Parker Society), ii. 428.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 434-5.

in which the new truths found voice. *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis* of the Wedderburns, published about 1542,[1] became the nucleus of a growth of song in the vernacular, which Provincial Councils and parliament in vain attempted to check.[2] Some of the ballads were translations of Lutheran hymns, some were original; some were quaint renderings of old Scottish love-ditties into the language of religion.[3] They had a two-fold aim and character. While many of them were denunciatory and consisted in fierce and sometimes coarse attacks upon the immorality and greed of bishops and priests, others were pathetic, devotional and mystical, appealing to conscience with directness and fervour.[4] But they all were distinctively popular, so much so that they can scarcely be ranked as literature and may indeed easily be ridiculed. Yet their value in simplifying doctrine and bringing it home to the rustic and artisan classes was immeasurable.[5]

In the five years that followed the fall of St. Andrews Castle there seem to have been no preachers of note in Scotland, but on the accession of Mary Tudor to the English throne an important addition was made to the forces of evangelism. Although Edwardine Protestantism had no direct influence upon Scotland, some of its most active agents had been fugitive Scotsmen; and several of them, when the Marian persecutions broke out, returned to their native land, practised in the art of preaching. Four of these gained positions of special prominence. John Willock, a friar who had been driven from Scotland by Beaton in 1534,[6] was a man of some patristic attainment,[7] skilled in

[1] See vol. i. 461.

[2] For the enactment of the Provincial Council of 1549 and the 'Act anent Printers' of 1552, see pages 27 and 29.

[3] Henderson, *Scottish Vernacular Literature*, pp. 271 ff.; Lang, *History*, ii. 32 ff.

[4] A specimen of each type of ballad will be found in Note P, p. 94.

[5] Even Lesley recognizes the ballads as among the causes of the increasing tumult; he classes them with the 'English books and treatises which were given forth by the preachers to stir sedition.'—*Historie* (Bann. Club. ed.), p. 269.

[6] See vol. i. 454.

[7] The Marquis of Dorset and Willock were the recipients of the two copies of Bullinger's *Fifth Decade*, brought to Scotland by John ab Ulmis.—Lorimer, *John Knox and the Church of England*, p. 44.

medicine and versed in affairs. When he fled from England in 1553 he found employment for a time with the Duchess of Friesland, but being sent by her twice to the Scottish Court on some trade business, he preached occasionally to the adherents of reform and was closely associated with Knox. Ultimately 'that notable man,' as Knox calls him, settled in Scotland (1558), to become, both then and at a later stage, one of the bravest and most skilful of leaders.[1] Another friar who became prominent at this stage was John Douglas, a Carmelite, who preached under the *alias* of 'Grant'; he was, like Willock, a man of scholarly gifts, and was as acceptable when teaching the children of barons as when preaching to Leith sailors.[2] William Harlaw, on the other hand, was 'a plain and unlearned man,' whom churchmen derided because originally he had been a tailor in Edinburgh; but, when a fugitive in England, he was ordained as deacon in the Edwardine Church, and, on his return to Scotland in 1554 or 1555, became noted for his preaching in Edinburgh and the neighbourhood.[3] To the same class belonged the chief Dundee Reformer of the period, Paul Methven, a baker, who when in exile came under the influence of Miles Coverdale, and on his return was held in high honour as 'a mild man who preached the Evangel of grace and remission of sins with great persuasiveness.'[4] It was through the zeal of such men, who came to be known definitely as 'the preachers,' that the movement spread. Taking no share in politics, they ministered to 'companies' which gradually increased in number and in size. Lesley describes them contemptuously as 'stirring up the rude people, the unlearned and the blind with their gukit (stupid), unwise and glaiket (foolish) preachings in chimney-nooks, secret holes and sic

[1] *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 261-4; Hume Brown, *John Knox*, i. 290; Knox, *Works*, i. 245; Lang, *History*, ii. 46.

[2] David Laing shows that Keith and others have been wrong in identifying this man with John Douglas, provost of St. Mary's College from 1551 till 1572. The able letter to Archbishop Hamilton printed in Knox, *Works*, i. 281-290, was no doubt from his pen.

[3] M'Crie, *Knox*, p. 104; Knox, *Works*, i. 245, 256; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 150.

[4] *Panmure Register*, i. p. xxxii; Knox, *Works*, vi. 532. The catastrophe in which Methven's career closed will be narrated in a later chapter.

private places.'[1] But the need for secrecy varied with the mood and temper of churchmen in different localities, and in the principal burghs they had as a rule liberty of speech. In Dundee, for example, the Church authorities attempted in 1554 to withdraw children from a school in which they were imbibing 'heretical' ideas; but the Town Council intervened in the interests of the heretic and in defiance of a sentence of cursing pronounced by the Archbishop's Court.[2]

The Scottish gentry who favoured Reformation varied so greatly in their religious character that it is impossible to describe them accurately in terms either of censure or of praise.[3] Several of them were as genuine in their Protestantism as Balnavis, who has been mentioned already. Their leader at this stage, Alexander, fifth earl of Glencairn, had written against the Franciscans as early as 1540, and in 1543 had been denounced by churchmen as 'an avowed favourer of Christ's word and doctrine.'[4] He was one of those who plotted the destruction of Beaton, and, according to Knox, he protested publicly against the execution of Adam Wallace. Equally consistent in favouring the Reformers were the fourth Earl of Argyll, who, till his death in 1558, harboured the preacher Douglas in his castle, and his son the fifth earl.[5] With these must be ranked the young Prior of St. Andrews, James Stewart, natural son of James V, who had already given promise, by his bravery in battle and his steady forcefulness in politics, of the career which earned for him the title 'Good Regent Moray.' Only gross blindness or bias can place these men among 'political

[1] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 397. There is not a shadow of foundation for Lesley's statement that the preachers were imported from Germany by the Lords; not one of them came from Germany.—Cf. *Historie* (Bann. Club ed.), pp. 261-266.

[2] Edgar, *History of Early Scottish Education*, pp. 116-17.

[3] Froude has erred gravely by generalizing about the Scottish barons. Having described them as men who 'passed into the new era unshackled with the memories of superstition and for the most part with a noble desire for some faith in which they could live as honest men,' he proceeds to designate the same men as 'gaunt and hungry nobles, careless most of them of God or devil, who eyed the sleek and well-fed clergy like a pack of famished wolves.' —*History of England*, vi. 219, 226.

[4] *State Papers*, Sadleyr, i. 83.

[5] Hume Brown, *Life of Knox*, i. 329; Lang, *History*, i. 407 ff.

adventurers who used religious watchwords to conceal their ambitions and their avarice.' On the other hand, they had as allies men to whom such language may be applied with propriety. The evasions and equivocations of Lord Erskine, afterwards Regent Mar, are familiar to all readers of political history. Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange showed himself a hero in the battle-field and was for a time extremely deferential to Knox, but the very highest praise that can be assigned to his public actions is that he was tolerably consistent in opposing the influence of France.[1] The subordination of religion to secular interests became still more notorious in the devices and gyrations of Sir William Maitland (b. 1528), generally styled 'Lethington' from his hereditary estate in the neighbourhood of Haddington. The son of a courtier who had held the Privy Seal, Lethington was educated on the Continent and developed his high natural abilities by versatile study of modern, ancient and Biblical lore to a pitch which justified Queen Elizabeth in calling him 'the flower of the wits of Scotland.' He entered the service of Mary of Lorraine in 1554, and became a member of the Privy Council. Repeatedly he represented Scotland in public and private negotiations with conspicuous skill, and over the Regent he acquired such influence that when in 1558 he became her Secretary of State he was said to 'rule her body and soul.'[2] His political aim was to uphold her in power while checking her endeavour to increase the authority of France in Scotland, and he claimed afterwards to have sought from the first for union with England.[3] That he was interested in the religious contentions of his time and, generally, favourable to the Reformation is indisputable, but it is also certain that when political issues were at stake, he was ready to regard religion as 'a bogle of the nursery.'[4]

[1] Henry II of France spoke of Kirkaldy as 'one of the most valiant men of our age.' His career is succinctly narrated by L. Barbé in the 'Famous Scots' Series.

[2] Hume, *Spanish Calendar*, i. 38.

[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 610.

[4] The picturesque biography of Lethington by Skelton requires to be checked by the results of recent investigations, which are collected in E. Russell's *Maitland of Lethington.*

The forces we have indicated were all adverse to the influence of churchmen and told steadily both upon the governing classes and upon the governed; but they lacked solidity until, in 1555, Knox suddenly reappeared in Scotland, with unaltered convictions but widened experience and an established reputation. His experiences in England, Switzerland and Germany, although highly important biographically, have a place in this volume only so far as they affected his policy,[1] and may therefore be summarized briefly.

On the accession of Edward VI, the intercession of the English government secured the liberation of all the Scottish prisoners. Knox, who was set free before the others, became at once a strenuous agent in the endeavours of Edward VI and his ministers to establish Protestantism in England. In a Record Office list of April 7, 1549, he appears among preachers licensed by the government, which was sadly in need of help, owing to the antagonism of most of the English prelates, the incapacity of the parish priests and the attachment of the populace to Roman usages.[2] He discharged this office, first at Berwick and thereafter at Newcastle, with such effectiveness that in December 1551 he was appointed one of six royal preachers or chaplains, who being 'accounted,' says Burnet, 'the most zealous and ready preachers of that time, were sent about as itinerants to supply the defects of the greatest part of the clergy, who were generally very faulty.' In a private letter written in 1553 he avowed penitently that he 'failed to speak the truth of God with sufficient boldness,'[3] and in after years he lamented that in England he had not been plain of speech;[4] but his standard in such matters was unlike that of other

[1] In this respect Knox is an admirable model; so scrupulously does he avoid in his *History* all details about himself which have not a clear bearing upon his narrative. On his work in England, see Lorimer, *John Knox and the Church of England*. His movements on the Continent are fully narrated by Hume Brown (*John Knox*, i. 151-258).

[2] In 1551 Hooper reported that out of 311 clergy in his diocese, 171 could not repeat the Ten Commandments and 27 did not know who was author of the Lord's Prayer.—*English Historical Review*, xix. 98 ff. In 1549 he described 'the people' as 'a many-headed monster . . . fascinated by the inveiglement of the bishops and the malice and impiety of the mass-priests.'—Lorimer, p. 13.

[3] Lorimer, p. 42. [4] Pollard, *Political History of England*, p. 77.

men. As early as 1550 he was called upon to justify his violent denunciations of the mass; again and again he was brought into trouble by the unaccommodating character of his doctrine, and even when preaching before the court, his criticisms of the equivocations and compromises of the government had distinctive stringency. In 1552 the vacant bishopric of Rochester was pressed upon him, and in 1553 he was presented to the vicarage of Allhallows, Bread Street, which had for some time been recognized as the principal platform for Protestant preaching.[1] Although he refused both appointments, there was no abatement in his zeal. His preaching office terminated with the death of Edward VI, but he was reluctant to leave England, which seemed to him to be suffering shipwreck, and he continued to preach in Buckinghamshire and elsewhere, when most of the Reforming preachers had fled. It was only in March 1554 that he sailed for the Continent, carrying with him an abiding concern in the religion of the English people, and leaving with his opponents bitter recollections of his influence.

The reasons which led Knox to refuse the high offices which were tendered to him are sufficiently plain. When called before the Privy Council to justify his refusal of the benefice of Allhallows, he stated explicitly that he thought that his services would be more valuable elsewhere than in London, that Northumberland 'had given a contrary command,' and that, besides, a parish clergyman in England had not authority to exercise discipline over his flock, which was 'a chief point of a clergyman's office'; yet he could not refuse 'to promote God's glory in utterance of Christ's gospel.'[2] His refusal of the bishopric of Rochester was due to similar reasons. The proposal to promote him was a diplomatic move on the part of Northumberland, who desired to have Knox in the south in order 'to quicken and sharp the Bishop of Canterbury' and confound the Anabaptists, and also to withdraw him from the north, where

[1] Allhallows had been the scene of the preaching of Launcelot Saunders.—Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, iv. 345, 346.

[2] Calderwood, *Historie*, i. 280.

his preaching was becoming a nucleus of those who would not comply with the government's enactments, and who were being augmented by Scotsmen attracted to Newcastle by his forceful eloquence. He interviewed Knox on the subject unsuccessfully, reporting to Cecil that he 'loved not to have to do with men which be neither grateful nor pleasable.'[1] Knox suspected and disliked the policy of Somerset and Northumberland and declined to become involved in it by taking an official part in the guidance and administration of the Church. 'What moved me to refuse and that with displeasure of all men was . . . assuredly the foresight of trouble to come. How oft have I said unto you that the time would not be long that England would give me bread.'[2] At this stage he raised no objection on principle to the office or title of bishop, recognizing the place of the episcopate in the New Testament Church; but he regarded it as the primary function of a bishop to feed the Church of God (Acts xx. 28), and the food which the flock required was the preaching of the Word.[3] As for himself, he was by this time conscious that his work lay in preaching, and he declined to be involved in those diplomatic and administrative occupations which were the portion of the bishops of the time,[4] just as, eight years later in the Scottish Church, he refused the office of superintendent which he himself had

[1] Tytler, *England under Edward VI and Mary*, ii. 142-8.

[2] Knox, *Works*, iii. 122. Lang (*John Knox*, p. 36), who misquotes the passage, ascribes Knox's refusal to reluctance 'to face the fire of persecution'—a preposterous explanation; a bishop's dangers were not to be compared with a preacher's.

[3] The same view of episcopacy was expressed in Balnavis' treatise which Knox sent to Scotland in 1548 with cordial commendation. A special chapter of the treatise deals with the office of 'bishop or minister,' censuring bishops who 'mix themselves with worldly matters' and fail to preach the Word. Balnavis discusses apostolical succession, not as it is discussed in the twentieth century; the question is as to the power of the Pope to confer the succession upon bishops: he argues that the true succession is secured by the discharge of function, not by 'a politic or ceremonial succession.' To 'episcopacy' he, like Knox, raises no objection.—Knox, *Works*, iii. 460, 531 ff.

[4] In *A Brief Exhortation*, published as late as 1559, Knox objects to the 'yearly coming of bishops to parliament,' and derides 'the glorious titles of lords and the devilish pomp of proud prelates'; but he makes no proposal for the abolition of the office. Among the items essential to 'a severe reformation' he includes a subdivision of every bishopric into ten, so that 'every city and great town' may have a godly learned man with so many joined with him, for preaching and instruction as may be thought sufficient.'—*Works*, v. 518, 519.

instituted. His motives, indeed, closely resembled those which led St. Augustine to evade episcopal office until it was dexterously imposed upon him by the aged Bishop of Hippo.

The principal contendings of Knox in England were with regard to the established order of worship, especially the observance of holy communion; and his attitude on this matter must be defined, as it affected the Scottish Church permanently. In the First Prayer Book of Edward VI,[1] which received royal sanction a few weeks before his settlement in England, the identity of the Lord's Supper with the mass was assumed,[2] and kneeling, although not prescribed, was the posture implied. To this whole conception Knox was resolutely opposed.[3] At Berwick, and probably at Newcastle, he administered the Supper as he had administered it at St. Andrews, the communicants sitting as at 'a table,' not kneeling before an altar, and emphasis being in other ways laid upon the difference between the Supper and the mass.[4] In April 1550 he gave public account, before the Bishop of Durham, of his teaching, that the mass is 'vain, false and deceivable . . . expressly contrary to the Lord's Supper.'[5] The use of the First Prayer Book was nowhere rigidly enforced, and in the north of England, largely through Knox's influence, was infrequent. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI[6] was prepared under the influence of Hooper and à Lasco, and avoided many expressions which recall the mass, but at one point Knox condemned it strenuously—the injunction that communicants should partake kneeling. His objection was not to the posture, which he admitted to be optional, but to the implication that the body and blood of the Lord are to be adored by communicants as actually present. In the

[1] '*The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes*' (1549).

[2] The title of the sacrament was explicit, viz., 'The Supper of the Lorde, and the holy Communion commonly called the Masse.' [3] See page 65.

[4] See letter to the congregation of Berwick, quoted in Lorimer, pp. 251-265.

[5] Knox, *Works*, iii. 61, 64.

[6] '*The Boke of Common Praier and administracion of the Sacramentes*' (1552).

autumn of 1552, when the book was in the press, it fell to him to preach before the King at Windsor; and in his sermon he set forth his objection with such persuasive force that, although the injunction to kneel was retained, the Privy Council added an explanation, styled afterwards by those who adhered to medieval doctrine 'the Black Rubric,' which expressed the mind of Knox and left the impress of his trenchant style[1] upon the standards of the English Church.[2] Since the teaching of the rubric prevailed for at least a century in Scotland, its words must be recorded:

'Although no order can be so perfectly devised but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved and interpreted in a wrong part, and yet because brotherly charity willeth that, so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away, therefore we willingly do the same: Whereas it is ordained in the book of common prayer in the administration of the Lord's Supper that the communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion, which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the holy Communion might else ensue; yet, lest the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done or ought to be done either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence[3] there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine they remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here; for it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than in one at the same time.'

This repudiation not only of transubstantiation but of the Lutheran doctrine was unquestionably due to Knox's influence. 'The runagate Scot,' said Weston in his examination of Latimer at Oxford, 'did take away the adoration or

[1] Lorimer, however (p. 120), detects in the rubric the spirit and the style of Cranmer.

[2] The rubric was entered in the Acts of Privy Council, although it had not the authority of parliament or Convocation.—Gairdner, *History of English Church*, iv. 308; Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, p. 131. In the Prayer Book of 1559 it was omitted because it 'had played havoc with the eucharistic doctrine.'—Frere, *History of English Church*, v. 28. In 1662 it was restored with slight alterations, and it still retains its place.—W. H. Hutton, *Ibid.*, vi. 190.

[3] In 1662 'real and essential presence' was changed into 'corporal presence.'

worshipping of Christ in the sacrament; so much prevailed that one man's authority at that time.'[1] Knox himself was satisfied with what he had secured. At the end of 1552 he wrote to the congregation of Berwick that in the interests of peace they might acquiesce in faulty forms of worship provided that the civil powers gave public assurance that sound doctrine was not thereby prejudiced. Although he much preferred sitting at the Lord's table, he was 'not minded to break or trouble common order for the maintenance of that one thing,' and he advised the congregation to defer to the 'godly magistrates' who were 'seeking to promote God's glory.'[2] Although he asserts that he 'will not give place to man or angel in the chief points of religion,' he accepts generally the view which prevailed among Englishmen that it lay with the civil powers to determine religious issues and to regulate worship, and sets forth the evils of schism and the need for guarding national unity in language suggestive of the temper which led England to acquiesce almost blindly in religious changes dictated by sovereigns.[3]

It is not strange that Knox's view of the authority of magistrates changed when they ceased to be 'godly' and were represented by Mary Tudor; yet the change was slow and deliberate. When, in March 1554, he fled from England, his mind was filled with the subject, and he made his way to Switzerland, to consult the leaders of the Reformation—first, Calvin at Geneva, and then Bullinger at Zürich. The

[1] *Acts and Monuments*, vi. 510. Townsend, the editor of Foxe, with Wordsworth and others, held that the 'runagate Scot' was Alexander Alesius (see vol. i. 463), but Alesius was not in England after 1540. Lorimer (p. 134) has placed it beyond dispute that Knox was the 'runagate.' Cf. Gairdner, *History of English Church*, iv. 308. Knox has also been credited with the omission from the Forty-two Articles of Religion of a declaration that all the ceremonies prescribed in the Prayer Book were consistent with the 'liberty of the Gospel.' A remonstrance against any such declaration was certainly lodged, but Knox's share in the remonstrance is indistinct.—Lorimer, p. 110 ff.; Hume Brown, *Knox*, i. 130-2.

[2] Lorimer, pp. 251-265.

[3] A Spanish ambassador reported that the English 'discharge their duty to their prince by living as he lives, believing what he believes, and doing whatever he commands. . . . They would do the like by the Mahommedan or Jewish creed.'—*Venetian Calendar*, vi., 1018, 1074-5; Pollard, p. 131-2. The English people 'acquiesced tamely in Mary's Romanism.'—Gairdner, *Lollardy*, iv. 371, 399.

questions which he asked, although propounded in the abstract, referred plainly to the situation which had arisen in England and in Scotland, and showed that he had the latter country mainly in mind. He desired an opinion as to the rights of royal minors and the title of queens to transfer their sovereignty to their husbands; but, besides, he asked a question which was pregnant with meaning as regards Scottish affairs: whether noblemen (*proceres*) were entitled to use their military resources in repelling from themselves and their friends the ungodly violence of a 'magistrate' who enforced idolatry and condemned the true religion, and whether godly persons should attach themselves to a religious nobleman who resisted an ungodly sovereign.[1] Calvin's reply is not extant; and Bullinger cautiously recommended prayer and discretion in matters that affected civil order, saying that every case should be decided as it arose in view of circumstances. Knox, however, was gradually reaching a more definite conclusion, and at this stage published two letters[2] to his friends in England, denouncing Mary Tudor and her advisers with a vehemence which is said to have fanned the fury of persecution and to have been regretted by the English Protestants. His next experiences still further sharpened his judgments. At Geneva, to which he returned at the beginning of August, he found Calvin at the last stage of his struggle with the Town Council for the independence of the Church, and so learned how little 'rulers' could be trusted even when they were Protestant magistrates. After a few weeks spent in the company of 'that singular instrument of God'—so he termed Calvin before making his acquaintance—he reluctantly undertook a mission which proved eventful, not for him only,

[1] Knox, *Works*, iii. 221-6.

[2] Both letters were written from Dieppe in 1554: *A Godly Letter to the Faithful in London*, etc., in March, and *A Faithful Admonition to the professors of God's truth in England*, in July.—*Works*, iii. 165-215; 253-330. In the first of these Knox plainly said that 'the prophets of God sometimes may teach treason against kings and yet neither he nor such as obeys the word spoken in the Lord's name by him, offends God.'—*Works*, iii. 184. Knox moved from place to place this summer—from Geneva to Zürich, thence to Dieppe and back to Geneva.

but for religious parties in England. At Frankfort on the Main a congregation of Protestant exiles differed as to their form of worship, one party contending for the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, another for the less ornate ritual of the French reformers. Knox, who in response to an invitation became their minister in 1554, sided with the latter party. The contention became keen, and, although he showed both self-restraint and generosity, he was banished from Frankfort, after a ministry of four months, on the groundless charge of political treason.[1] Historians of the English Church have regarded the troubles at Frankfort as an important stage in that cleavage of English Protestantism which resulted in the hostility between churchmen and puritans, but for the Scottish Church its importance was less extensive but more definite. Knox abandoned finally the attitude of tolerance for the revised Prayer Book. With the support of Calvin, who found in it '*tolerabiles ineptiae*,' he thenceforward spoke of it with deep dislike as superstitious, Romish and dangerous for the faithful.[2] At the time of the Frankfort troubles, the Second Prayer Book was making way among the Scottish Reformers as a symbol of Protestantism; but when six years later the Scottish Church came under Knox's guidance, his verdict on the 'Book of England' became the verdict of the nation.

To the twentieth-century reader Knox seems to have been preparing for the work that lay before him in his native land, but the preparation was unconscious. Since his escape from the galleys he had taken no part and shown no interest in Scottish affairs. When banished from Frankfort (March 26, 1555) he returned to Geneva, and was appointed by

[1] The chief authority for what was in itself *dissidium valde absurdum* (Calvin) is *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort*, published in 1575.—Knox, *Works*, iv. 3-68; see Hume Brown, *Knox*, i. 162-186.

[2] Knox acknowledges that he had changed his mind. 'Once,' he writes, 'I had a good opinion of the book.' But at Frankfort his attitude was firm. 'Neither yet would Master Knox minister the Communion by the Book of England, for that there were things in it placed (as he said) only by warrant of man's authority, and no ground in God's Word for the same, and had also a long time very superstitiously in the mass been wickedly abused.'—Knox, *Works*, v. 21.

Calvin, on June 10, to minister to a congregation of English exiles established there; and he gave himself to quiet study and the duties of his pastorate, thankful to rest after eight years of incessant strain and strife. It was not by a sense of public duty nor by the stirrings of Christian patriotism that within a few weeks his quietness was broken and he was drawn to the scene of the great achievements of his life, but by the urgency of a petulant and unreasonable woman whom, in his own language, 'God made the instrument to draw him from the den of his own ease'; she 'alone did draw him from the rest of quiet study.'[1]

The influence of domesticities upon history can never safely be ignored, for the leaders of nations and of churches have neither operated like machines nor been guided in their careers by abstract principles. And the career of Knox is unintelligible if he is regarded only as a grim and persistent dialectician, who loathed the mass and yearned to exterminate the papacy. His defiant and resolute exterior concealed an unusually sensitive spirit, which became tremulous on the eve of momentous encounters, and habitually found repose in the interchange of religious experiences with his familiar and trusted friends. In the course of his ministry at Berwick he had formed an intimate friendship with a lady of some social position, Mrs. Elizabeth Bowes, aged at that time about fifty, some fifteen years older than he. Their correspondence, which explains many phases of Knox's life otherwise inexplicable, discloses her as a deeply devout, Bible-loving woman, who had cordially accepted the Reformed faith, but was often distressed about the safety of her soul and exacting in her demands upon her friends. At Berwick, Knox became engaged to one of her fifteen children, Marjorie, but marriage was hindered by the opposition of Mrs. Bowes' family, specially her husband, who adhered firmly to the old Church and also thought that a match with a man of low degree like Knox was unsuitable. The strained family relations which resulted came to a crisis about 1554, and Mrs. Bowes seems to have resolved

[1] Knox, *Works*, iv. 217.

that the marriage should take place in defiance of her kindred. The letter in which she summoned Knox has not been preserved, but it was urgent, and there is neither reason nor room for questioning his own statement that he complied with reluctance. His reluctance may possibly be explained by the fact that Mrs. Bowes herself was to be an adjunct of the marriage, and that Knox, highly as he prized correspondence and conversation with her, had dubieties about her as the inmate of a household, and it must be remembered that the strict views of the early Reformers as to sex relationships tended to abate the sentimental and romantic aspect of wedlock. In the autumn, however, he reached Berwick, where he was gladdened by finding that the Protestant cause had considerable vitality, and, either before or after his marriage,[1] resolved to visit those of his old comrades who were in Edinburgh, intending to stay only a few days.

The visit, however, lasted for nine months, and proved to be of very great consequence. In Edinburgh he was welcomed with a warmth and eagerness which amazed him. The 'fervent thirst for the bread of life exceeded anything he had seen elsewhere.' The private houses in which he preached 'secretly' were crowded; the pastoral instinct, of which he had an unusual share,[2] was kindled into flame. On November 4 he wrote to Mrs. Bowes that she must excuse him for remaining some days: 'Depart he could not until such time as God should quench their thirst a little.' 'Sweet,' he wrote a little later, 'were the death that would follow forty days of Edinburgh such as I have had three; rejoice, mother, the time of our deliverance approacheth.'[3] Yet he was not absorbed in such evangelism. His keen

[1] No record has been discovered of the date of Knox's marriage, but it certainly took place between October 1555 and July 1556. David Laing (Knox, *Works*, vi. 61) says in 'the spring of 1556,' without explaining how he reaches that date. The first child of the marriage was born at Geneva in May 1557.

[2] He records in his *History* that 'the spouse of a burgess delighted much in his company, for that he opened more fully to her troubled conscience the fountain of God's mercies.'—*Ibid.*, i. 246.

[3] *Ibid.*, iv. 217-218.

eye diagnosed the situation: the Protestant barons were hesitating and disposed to temporize; they were not supporting the 'preachers' in taking advantage of the opportunity furnished by the political necessities of the Regent; the cause of Reformation lacked solidity and unity. Accordingly, while making Edinburgh his centre,[1] he moved from the house of one 'lord' to another, giving religious instruction to households, dispensing communion to those whose earnestness was manifest,[2] and urging them to dissociate themselves from Church usages which they at heart condemned and to support the preachers openly. Repeatedly he visited the districts of Ayrshire and Angus which specially favoured the new teaching, but he also made his way to the seat of the Earl of Argyll at Castle Campbell, and to Finlayston in Renfrewshire, where he was the guest of the Earl of Glencairn. The most cordial of his hosts, however, was Erskine of Dun, at whose Edinburgh residence a conference was held which included both leading preachers such as Willock and men like Maitland of Lethington, whose 'zeal to godliness' was not such as to prevent them from attending mass. The discussion was keen; the advocates of compromise laying great stress upon the compliance of St. Paul, on the advice of St. James and the elders, with Jewish usages. To this plea Knox replied with the same freedom which Luther had shown in similar debates. The paying of vows, he said, was sometimes God's commandment and was most unlike the odious idolatry of the mass, but, apart from this, it was doubtful whether either the command of James or the obedience of Paul proceeded from the Holy Ghost, seeing that Paul was led thereby into the most desperate danger, and confirmed the Jews in their superstition, bringing himself and his doctrine into contempt. By such arguments the barons were convinced that 'nowise was it lawful for a Christian to present himself to that idol,' and Lethington wound up

[1] When preaching in Edinburgh Knox sometimes resided with a burgess, James Syme, sometimes with Sir James Sandilands, near Mid-Calder.

[2] The stress which Knox always laid upon 'the sacrament' is shown by the care with which he records the occasions on which it was observed.

the debate by saying, 'I see perfectly that our shifts will serve nothing before God, seeing that they stand us in so small stead before man.'[1] Two months later, at Erskine's country residence, 'the most part of the gentlemen of the Mearns,' after a communion service, agreed that they would have 'no fellowship with idolatry,' and would 'maintain the true preaching of the evangel as God should offer them preachers and opportunity.'[2] This agreement may not have been a covenant in the technical sense,[3] but it was a token of that definite co-operation between barons and preachers by which the reformation of the Church was ultimately secured.

At this stage the bishops, at the instigation, Knox says, of the friars, summoned him to appear before them at Edinburgh on May 15; and he complied with the summons, being escorted to Edinburgh by Erskine and 'divers other gentlemen.' But before the day appointed the bishops cancelled the summons, and Knox preached for ten days, morning and evening, to 'a greater audience than ever before in the great lodging of the Bishop of Dunkeld.'[4] Among hearers who came under cover of night was William Keith, fourth Earl Marischal, who was so impressed by what he heard that he joined Glencairn in persuading Knox to address a letter to the Regent. The letter written was a wise and moderate one, pleading for religious liberty and for a reform of the Church. Knox urged the Regent to check persecution, and to refrain from upholding a corrupt system which was proved to be hurtful to the morals of her subjects. He recognized the difficulties of her situation and the political complications in which she was entangled, but he reminded her that the Church which she supported was

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 248. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 251.

[3] M'Crie (*Life of Knox*, p. 110) designates this 'the first religious covenant'; but David Laing doubts if it 'assumed the form of a covenant.'—Knox, *Works*, i. 251 n. Cf. D. Hay Fleming, *Story of the Scottish Covenants*, p. 6.

[4] There is no reason for thinking that the Bishop, Robert Crichton, favoured the Reformers; indeed he proved one of the few stalwarts.—Dowden, *Bishops of Scotland*, pp. 91-4. Yet it is illustrative of the complicated situation that Earl Marischal shrank from open attendance at meetings held in a bishop's house.

not infallible, and that rulers are responsible for the religion of their realms, and are bound to curb the misdemeanours of churchmen.[1] The letter was couched in respectful, almost deferential terms, but the Regent passed it on to the Archbishop of Glasgow, saying, 'Please you, my lord, to read a pasqwill.'[2]

While Knox's vigour was thus bringing matters to a crisis, he received an urgent summons from his congregation at Geneva; and, despite the entreaties of his friends, he sailed from Scotland at the beginning of July, after a round of farewell visits to those to whom he had ministered. When sailing he promised that, 'if God blessed these small beginnings and they continued in godliness,' he would obey any call to return to their service. In a letter of wholesome counsel[3] he defined his idea of 'continuing in godliness' in terms full of significance. He gives his 'testimony in love' that the only organ and instrument by which God strengthens the weak and maintains the life of the soul is His Word, which must be studied carefully and in its completeness, no day being allowed to slip, even when they are held in such bondage that they cannot have the bread of life broken unto them. Yet their Scripture reading must not be in secret for their own guidance alone:

'No, brethren, ye are ordained of God to rule your own houses in His true fear and according to His Word. Within your own houses . . . ye are bishops and kings; your wife, children, servants and family are your bishopric and charge. Of you it shall be required how carefully and diligently ye have always instructed them in God's true knowledge, how that ye have studied in them to plant virtue and repress vice. And therefore, I say, ye must make them partakers in reading, exhorting, and in making common prayers, which I would were used in every house once a day at least. But above all things, dear brethren, study to practise in life that which the Word of God commandeth, and be ye assured that ye shall never hear nor read the same without fruit.'

[1] Knox, *Works*, iv. 75-84.

[2] 'Pasquil,' which means a libellous skit, is derived from a statue at Rome of Pasquino or Pasquillus, to which witty sarcasms upon dignitaries were affixed. Knox did not hear till afterwards that his letter had been received with 'mockage.' When informed in 1558, he republished it with enlargements and in a completely changed tone.—*Ibid.*, ii. 425-460.

[3] *Ibid.*, iv. 129-140.

He proceeds to urge that the members of the 'Congregation which St. Paul calls the Body of Christ' are bound to uphold one another by meeting once a week at least in assemblies to 'confer upon the Scriptures.' At their conferences, after confession of sin and invocation of the Spirit, a passage is to be read, and, 'if any brother have exhortation, question or doubt, let him not fear to speak so that he do it with moderation.' In this way the whole of the Bible will become familiar, men's judgments and modesty will be made known and their gifts and utterance will appear; but wordiness, prolixity and wilful reasoning, which are to be avoided in all places, are intolerable in the congregation, where only the glory of God and the comfort or edification of the brethren should be regarded. If the meaning of any text baffles them, the difficulty should be reduced to writing before the congregation disperse, with a view to consulting the absent brethren who will be ready, according to their ability, to give assistance. Knox himself will more gladly spend fifteen hours in explaining to them any place of Scripture as God opens it to him, than half an hour in any matter beside. The Bible should be read continuously, so that they may hear the harmony and well-timed song of the Holy Spirit which spoke to the fathers from the beginning, and their meetings should always close with common prayers for princes, rulers and magistrates, for the liberty and free passage of Christ's evangel, for the comfort and deliverance of the afflicted brethren now persecuted most cruelly in France and England, and for such other things as the Spirit shall teach them to be profitable either to themselves or to their brethren, wheresoever they be. So they shall be as stars in the night season, as wheat among the cockle, through fellowship with the Lord Jesus in His body and blood; yea, they shall be of the number of the prudent virgins, daily renewing their lamps with oil. It was by such teaching—by making the reading of the Bible the foundation of religion, by teaching men that their families were their bishoprics which they were bound to feed, and by making weekly worship a scene of prayerful inquiry into the

meaning of the divine word—rather than by his astute guidance of the half-hearted gentry, that Knox brought revival to Ecclesia Scoticana.

At Geneva, where Calvin had now finally mastered his opponents,[1] Knox found a thoroughly congenial home. 'It is,' he wrote on December 9, 'the most perfect school of Christ that ever was on earth since the days of the Apostles. In other places I confess Christ to be truly preached, but manners and religion so sincerely reformed I have not yet seen anywhere.'[2] Besides ministering to the men who were engaged in producing the Geneva Bible,[3] he was occupied in preparing an English version of Calvin's Church Order[4] and in refuting an Anabaptist who had attacked Calvin's doctrine of Predestination. Meanwhile the Scottish bishops had arraigned him in his absence and burned his effigy at the Edinburgh Cross. But the seed which he had sown grew rapidly. 'The Gospel began wondrously to flourish.'[5] Harlaw preached publicly in Edinburgh and Methven at Dundee, while Douglas, protected by the Earl of Argyll, made frequent visits to Leith, and Willock, although hindered by ill-health, had the ear of educated hearers. Conventions, such as Knox had counselled, were held, and the 'hearts of men were so strengthened that they sought to have the face of a kirk among them.'[6] According to an almost contemporary document,[7] even before there was any 'face' of the true religion, and when men were holding 'exercises' sometimes in the field and sometimes in houses by night, overseers, elders, and deacons were appointed, and as the months passed there was plainly seen 'the face of a public church reformed.' Whether Edinburgh or Dundee, which in Wishart's time had shown signs of Church development,[8]

[1] Hume Brown's *Knox*, i. 187.
[2] Knox, *Works*, iv. 240.
[3] The translation of the New Testament appeared in 1557, the complete Bible in 1560.
[4] The Order, which had been drafted by Knox and three others during the troubles of Frankfort, was published at Geneva in 1556 under the title, 'The form of prayers and ministration of the Sacraments, etc., used in the English Congregation at Geneva, and approved by the famous and godly learned man John Calvin.'—Knox, *Works*, iv. 149 ff.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 256.
[6] *Ibid.*, i. 300.
[7] Dunlop, *Collection of Confessions*, ii. 636, 637.
[8] See vol. i. 476.

led in this important movement is disputable,[1] but it is certain that in both places it became clear in 1557 that the affairs of the Church as reformed would largely be controlled by 'seniors,' 'presbyters' or elders.

The appearance in Scotland of the 'eldership,' an institution which has developed in the Scottish Church as nowhere else, and has been carried by Scotsmen into every part of the world, was momentous for national religion. Yet it was far from implying the acceptance of a theory of Church government. Calvin, in his *Institutes*, had laid it down as a primary maxim that ministers ('bishops') should be associated in the exercise of discipline with 'seniors selected from the people,' on the ground that in apostolic times 'each church had its senate (Latin, *senatus*—French, *conseil ou consistoire*) composed of pious, grave and venerable men in whom was lodged the power of correcting faults.'[2] Seeing that elders are not mentioned in Scotland prior to the visit of Knox, we may be disposed to assume that he brought the conception with him from Geneva. But this is a doubtful hypothesis. The elders of Geneva who after 1541 met in a consistory were generically unlike the elders appointed at Dundee and Edinburgh in 1556 and 1557, both in the method of their appointment and in their authority. It has been suggested that the office came to Scotland from the French Reformed Church,[3] but that Church had not a single organized congregation until 1555, and there was no connexion in those years between Scottish and French Protestants.[4] Indeed attempts to revive the New Testament

[1] Knox (*Works*, i. 300) gives the priority to Dundee, the document quoted by Dunlop gives it to Edinburgh. Calderwood says that 'the professors of Edinburgh,' who 'held private conventions in fields and houses,' at first met in two groups, that the groups were united by Erskine of Dun, and increased daily, and that they 'had their own elders and deacons.'—*History*, i. 303-304. Calderwood dates this 1555, *i.e.*, before Knox's visit; but M'Crie (*Life of Knox*, p. 140) is probably right in saying that it was in 1556 or 1557. Calderwood, who is not a first-hand authority for this period, sometimes gives impossible dates.

[2] Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, iv. 3, 8.

[3] Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, ii. 169.

[4] At Dieppe, which Knox frequently visited, Protestantism first appeared in 1557, and took shape under Knox's influence.—*Histoire de la Reformation à Dieppe*, pp. 10 ff. (quoted in Hume Brown's *Knox*, i. 218, note 2).

eldership had been frequent among Reformers both in Germany and in Switzerland years before the publication of Calvin's *Institutes*,[1] and it is probable that they were reflected in the 'churches' which arose in the Dundee neighbourhood during the ministry of George Wishart.[2] The 'eldership' rested upon two beliefs which were shared by Reformers in all lands. (1) The first was that Church offices should have an explicit Scriptural warrant and should indeed be reproductions of the office by which the faithful were governed in Bible times. It was beyond dispute that elders had a recognized place in the administration of the Church of God both under the Old Testament and under the New, and the office was not one which had been perverted and corrupted in the pre-Reformation Church. It could therefore be accepted and defended as wholly Scriptural without the need for cleansing it from unscriptural accretions. (2) Further, it gave room for expression of the universal desire to take the administration of Church affairs, specially of Church discipline, out of the hands of ordained priests. So strong was this desire, so fully was it justified by the avarice and incompetence of the priesthood, that many of the most learned and philosophical historians of the sixteenth century have held that the Reformation was primarily a revolt of the laity against the clergy. In countries and communities which accepted Protestantism publicly, ecclesiastical powers were simply transferred to the civil rulers, Henry VIII, for example, becoming the 'Pope of England,' and the Elector of Saxony, at Luther's request, acting as 'emergency-bishop' (*Nothbischof*). But where the Reformers were persecuted by the civil powers, they required to erect on their own initiative a non-clerical office which would prevent the aggrandizement of their 'preachers,' many of whom had originally been priests and monks, and secure the exercise of Church discipline. In no country was this necessity more manifest than in Scotland; in none had

[1] Herzog regards Œcolampadius, who organized the Reformers at Basel in 1526, as the 'restorer of the New Testament eldership.'

[2] See vol. i. 476.

Church discipline been more shamefully neglected by the clergy; in none, therefore, did the eldership more rapidly take root. To these explanations must be added the consideration that the new nation was thoroughly democratic in its disposition, and that the Reformed beliefs were laying hold of the classes which were straining after liberty and independence. An elective office, held by men who belonged to no caste and were until their election ordinary members of the Church, was in line with their ideals as expressing a sense of equality. Accordingly the eldership at its first appearance in Scotland was—what Calvin never secured and scarcely desired—an office to which men were appointed by the free votes of the people,[1] and it was in those east coast burghs in which the spirit of freedom was most developed that 'sessions' or boards of elders were first organized.[2]

For nearly ten years after the attack upon Beaton the progress of the cause of reform was orderly. The only traces of iconoclasm are the already quoted [3] enactments of the Estates in 1546 and of the Provincial Council in 1549 against destroyers of images and injurers of Church fabrics. These were prompted by fear lest Scotland should be infected by the example of outrages set in England. In the later years of Henry VIII images and shrines which had been objects of devotion were removed by public authority;[4] on the accession of Edward VI there was much iconoclasm deliberately promoted by Government,[5] and the year 1550 saw the beginning of Ridley's crusade against altars and of the exportation of shiploads of images to be sold in France.[6] In Scotland attacks on church decorations began in 1556,

[1] According to Knox, 'the whole brethren promised obedience' to the first elders who were 'appointed by common election' for the express purpose of 'punishing open crimes without respect of persons.'—*Works*, i. 300. The so-called presbyterianism of Cartwright (1570), which came to light in 1590, 'was exclusively for admonition and excommunication.—W. A. Shaw, *English Historical Review*, iii. 655.

[2] In July 1559, the St. Andrews minister and elders appear as a compact body.—*St. Andrews Kirk Session Register* (S.H.S.), i. 1.

[3] See pages 21 n., 43.

[4] Gairdner, *Lollardy*, i. 320, ii. 360, 362.

[5] Froude, iv. 278-279; Pollard, *Political History*, p. 21.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 52, 53.

when the Regent and the Primate complained to the Edinburgh Town Council that images of the Trinity, Our Lady and St. Francis had been 'taken down' from churches, and an elaborate inquiry was instituted.[1] On St. Giles' Day (September 1) of the following year,[2] when, according to an ancient custom, the image of the saint was carried through the city, it was attacked by a crowd who had come from hearing Willock preach, thrown into the North Loch and thereafter burned. Archbishop Hamilton ordered the Town Council to replace the image, but they refused, and, on being excommunicated by the Archbishop, appealed to the Pope. Both the excommunication and the appeal appear to have lapsed, and about the same time 'images were stolen away in all parts of the country.'[3]

These outbreaks indicate that the tide of popular feeling was rising, and there was a contemporaneous movement among the barons and gentry. On March 10, 1557, Glencairn, Lorne, Erskine (Mar) and James Stewart wrote to Geneva urging Knox to return. They informed him that, although the public authorities were still hostile, 'the friars were daily in less and less esteem with the Regent and the rest of the nobility, that the flock was likely to be increased, and that they themselves were ready to jeopard life and goods in the forward setting of the glory of God.'[4] Knox was reluctant to leave his congregation, but Calvin and others whom he consulted assured him that if he refused the call, he would be 'rebellious unto his God and unmerciful to his country,' and in September he reached Dieppe on his way to Scotland. At Dieppe he was startled and distressed by the receipt of letters advising him to come no farther and

[1] *Edinburgh Burgh Records*, 1528-57, pp. 251, 252.

[2] There is uncertainty about the date of this first attack upon the image. *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland* dates it July 1558 'or a little before'—a date which agrees better with Knox's narrative than the date given above. On the other hand David Laing shows that the question of replacing the image was in debate before the end of 1557; this is conclusive.—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 54; Knox, *Works*, i. 258, 560; Lang, *History*, ii. 36.

[3] Knox, *Works*, i. 256. In 1558 the church of Echt was burned and images were destroyed in other churches of the diocese of Aberdeen.—Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, p. 357.

[4] Knox, *Works*, i. 267, iv. 257.

showing him that the barons had lost heart. He replied with severe reproaches, telling the barons that it 'appertains to more than to the clergy or chief rulers who are called kings' to reform religion, and that they, 'the princes of the people,' who are honoured, not for their birth, but for their office and their duty, are bound to deliver their fellow-countrymen and their Christian brethren from 'all violence and oppression, hazarding their lives, be it against kings or emperors.'[1]

After despatching this letter on October 27, Knox employed his irrepressible energies for some months in preaching at Dieppe, and returned to Geneva,[2] doubting if he ought not to have disregarded warnings and pressed on to Scotland. But his letter had done its work. The 'Lords' wrote at once both to him and to Calvin urging that he should come,[3] and on December 3 five of them, Argyll, Glencairn, Morton, Lorne and Erskine of Dun signed a document, which came to be known as the First Covenant and proved to be so important that its exact terms must be recorded:

'We, perceiving how Satan in his members, the antichrists of our time, cruelly doth rage seeking to downthrow and to destroy the evangel of Christ and His Congregation, ought according to our bounden duty to strive in our Master's cause even unto the death, being certain of the victory in Him. The which our duty being well considered we do promise, before the Majesty of God and His Congregation, that we (by His grace) shall with all diligence continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives to maintain, set forward and establish the most blessed Word of God and His Congregation, and that we shall labour at our possibility to have faithful ministers purely and truly to minister Christ's evangel and sacraments to His people. We shall maintain them, nourish them and defend them, the whole Congregation of Christ and every member thereof at our whole power and waring [risking] of our lives against Satan and all wicked power that does intend tyranny or trouble against the foresaid Congregation. Unto the which holy Word and Congregation we do join us, and also do forsake and renounce the Congregation of Satan with all the superstitions, abomination and idolatry thereof, and, moreover, shall declare ourselves

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 269-273. [2] He reached Geneva before March 1558.
[3] These letters were written before December 3, 1557, but not delivered till November 1558.—*Ibid.*, i. 274.

manifestly enemies thereto by this our faithful promise before God testified to His Congregation by our subscriptions at these presents. . . . God called to witness.'

The most vital and forceful item in this covenant is the frequently repeated phrase, 'the Congregation,' 'the Congregation of the Lord.' Its meaning was the reverse of the modern application of it to every body of people who regularly worship in the same place, but is consistent with the sixteenth-century usage, both Protestant and Catholic. In the Augsburg Confession the Church is defined as '*Congregatio sanctorum*,'[1] and, generally among Protestants, those who, in each land or community, worshipped separately applied the term 'Congregation' to their collective action; while the defenders of the Church, at least those of the liberal school like Quintin Kennedy, also defined the Church as the 'Congregation,'[2] differing only in holding that the members of the Congregation could not all exercise their office but must delegate it to officers. The use of it by the barons thus implied a definite claim to represent the cause and kingdom of Christ, just as their avowal of settled antagonism, not to any usage or doctrine but to the Congregation of Satan, involved unqualified hostility to the officials of the Church. It is true that the covenant had but slight constructive value and must not be regarded as an ecclesiastical movement. Its relation to the 'Churches' which were rising throughout the country was ancillary and protective, and it initiated a political rather than a religious development, contributing to the clearance of the ground rather than to the erection of a new building.[3] The covenanters, who were thenceforward known as the Lords of the Congregation, pledged themselves to be not the rulers but the defenders of the preachers, with whose interests they were now avowedly identified; and yet their adoption of this attitude promoted, and for a time secured,

[1] The *Confessio Variata* of 1540 reads, '*Congregatio membrorum Christi*'; the German is '*Versammlung aller Gläubigen*.'—Schaff, *Creeds of Evangelical Protestant Churches*, p. 11.

[2] So in the *Compendius Tractive*.—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 101 ff.

[3] Hill Burton, iii. 298, 346.

that union of the different forces opposed to the Church which Knox had seen to be essential.

Although only five names were at first appended to the covenant, many others were soon added,[1] and several meetings for deliberation were held, issuing in two resolutions which showed that the Lords, while conscious of their strength, proposed to act with moderation. They agreed (1) that in parish churches on Sundays and holy days curates should be required to read the lessons and prayers prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer,[2] and that, if curates were not qualified to read, or refused, the reading should be entrusted to the best qualified parishioner; (2) that exposition of Scripture should be given in private,[3] 'without great conventions of the people' until God should 'move the Prince [*i.e.*, the Regent] to grant public preaching by faithful and true ministers.'[4] Shortly after passing these resolutions[5] they presented a petition, or supplication, to the Regent requesting formal sanction for the use of the vernacular in reading Scripture, in public prayer and in the ministration of baptism and the Lord's Supper—the latter to be dispensed in both kinds. They further asked that it

[1] One copy recently discovered has only five signatures. Probably a number of copies, each signed by the leaders, were sent out for signatures.—Hay Fleming, *The Scottish Covenants*, p. 8.

[2] The prayer book used was no doubt the Second Book of Edward VI (see page 63), which, although by this time discarded by Knox, was regarded by English Protestants as a precious symbol. Rather poor attempts have been made by partisan writers to evade the fact that an English prayer book was used for a time by the Scottish Reformers. Kirkaldy and Cecil distinctly state that it was used as late as 1559.—*State Papers, Foreign* (1558-9), p. 367; Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 128; Knox, *Works*, vi. 34, 278; Spalding Club *Miscellany*, iv. 120.

[3] There is no justification for Bellesheim's statement (ii. 233) that 'without delay the Lords ejected the Catholic clergy and installed the Protestant preachers in their place.' On the contrary, they adhered to their plan. Douglas, *e.g.*, preached in Argyll's house, not in a parish church, and on March 5, 1558, Argyll wrote to Archbishop Hamilton, 'divers houses besides us profess the same God *secretly*.'—Knox, *Works*, i. 276-290.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 276.

[5] Hume Brown (*History*, ii. 48-9), following Knox, says that this was 'at the beginning of 1558.' In *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland* the date given is July 1558, but the dates in *A Historie* are sometimes erratic. Keith follows Buchanan in placing the supplication in November.—*Affairs*, i. 181; so Bellesheim, ii. 236. The supplication was presented by Sandilands of Calder, who had been Knox's host (see page 70 n. 1). Most of the leaders at this crisis were men who had come directly under Knox's influence.

should be made lawful for any qualified person to interpret difficult passages of Scripture at their conventions, and closed by 'humbly requiring' a reformation of 'the wicked, slanderous and detestable life of prelates and of the State Ecclesiastical.' Two quaint concessions in the supplication show that the petitioners were feeling their way forward very cautiously. With regard to the proposed liberty of expounding Scripture, they suggested that, to prevent confusion, debate and heresy, all interpretations should be subject to the judgment 'of the most godly and learned within the realm'; and, as to their claim for a reformation of the life of the clergy, they said that, lest they should be suspected of envying the honour or coveting the wealth of the prelates, they were willing that appeal should be allowed 'not only to the New Testament but to the writings of the ancient Fathers and the godly approved laws of Justinian the Emperor.'[1] How little was intended by this reference to the Fathers and Justinian became immediately apparent. The champions of the Church, to satisfy the Regent, proposed a public disputation, and the Reformers willingly agreed, on condition that all questions should be decided by Scripture and that their exiled brethren—undoubtedly they meant Knox—should be allowed to return and take part in the discussion. Thereupon the churchmen withdrew their proposal, and put forth a suggestion that Protestants might be allowed to pray and to baptize in the vernacular, 'secretly and not in open assembly,' provided that they agreed to tolerate the mass, the doctrine of purgatory, prayer to the saints and prayer for the dead, and to allow churchmen to retain their dignity and their properties. When the Lords rejected this concession—if liberty to choose one's own language in private prayer can be called a concession—the Regent trimmed. She said that the petitioners might 'use themselves godly according to their desires' if they held no public meetings in Edinburgh or Leith, and she promised to 'assist the preachers until some uniform order might be established by a parlia-

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 305.

ment.'[1] When the martyrdom of Myln on April 28[2] led the Lords to protest against the perversion of justice, she disclaimed responsibility, 'lamented the cruelty of the Bishop' and promised to prevent the repetition of 'such enormities.'[3]

While matters were thus in the balance, the plans of the Congregation were steadied by the arrival of two letters from Knox—letters which by their masterly clearness and moderation of tone recall the epistles by which Cyprian in his exile guided the perplexed Church of Carthage. In the one he asserted the claims of civil authority, warning the Lords against supporting the ambitious intrigues of Chatelherault, enjoining them not to disobey or displace the established authority, and urging them to strive only for the defence of their brethren from persecution and tyranny, and for the right ministration of Word and Sacrament. The other letter has a deeper interest, owing to the precision with which it sets forth doctrinal and ethical positions. In England and at Geneva, Knox had seen the mischief wrought by Anabaptists and other sects, in which a pretentious perfectionism had been combined with a spirit of anarchy and with heretical opinions. He writes to the Scots that he is more afraid of these men than of the papists, whose errors any child can discern, and urges them to adhere to the 'true Church,' which is to be found 'whereever God's Word has supreme authority, Christ is preached and received as the only Saviour of the world, the sacraments are truly ministered, and His Word ruleth, not the vain fantasy of man.' He repudiates not only the errors of Arius and Pelagius, but the idea that 'the life and conversation of man is an assured note, sign or token of God's visible Church.' The chief offence of the papacy, he says, is the teaching of false doctrine and the misuse of the sacraments; these underlie and are the cause of the moral laxity of priests and monks. The Congregation must not be surprised by the occasional lapses of their adherents, but be satisfied with 'the common righteousness promised to the

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 307. [2] See page 42. [3] Knox, *Works*, i. 308-9.

members of Christ's body by faith in Him,' and make it their great concern that 'no man, without trial and examination of his life, converse, doctrine and condition, take upon him the office of a preacher, or travail among the simple sheep of Christ Jesus. . . . Deceitful and false doctrine is the poison and venom which can with most difficulty be purged.' If they are careful for doctrine and guard the Church of God from error, they have no cause for fear. 'Seldom it is that open tyranny doth utterly suppress in any realm or province the true religion earnestly received by a multitude.'[1]

At the very time of writing those significant and weighty letters, Knox displayed the ruthless vehemence of his character by issuing a pamphlet entitled '*The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstruous regiment of women.*' The thesis of the pamphlet is stated at the outset: 'To promote a woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion or empire over any realm, nation or city, is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, most contrary to His revealed will and approved ordinance, and the subversion of good order, equity and justice.'[2] No doubt the character and policy of the women who at that time swayed affairs in England, Scotland and France, and specially their subjection to papal and priestly influences, explain the extravagance of the pamphlet,[3] but they do not suffice to give it a position in literature, and it owes its title to a place in history solely to the fact that it created serious difficulties for Knox by rousing the indignation of Queen Elizabeth. The same intolerance and the same view of the inability of women to govern, appear in an expanded edition of his Letter to the Regent which he published in the course of the summer.[4] By this time he had abandoned the idea that she was the 'ruler' or 'magistrate' with whom the government of Scotland lay, and in a concurrent appeal, or Appellation,[5]

[1] Those two letters, written at Dieppe in December 1557, are printed in Knox, *Works*, iv. 261-286. [2] *Ibid.*, iv. 373 ff.

[3] Hume Brown points out that Jean Bodin, the greatest political thinker of the sixteenth century, shared Knox's opinions as to the regimen of women.—*Knox*, i. 238. [4] *Works*, iv. 433-460. [5] *Ibid.*, iv. 465-520.

against the sentence passed upon him by the bishops in 1556, he urged upon the 'nobility and estates' their obligation to reform religion. Writers who have been anxious to exhibit Knox's severities, have expatiated upon the fact that in the Appellation he asserts that religious offences are punishable by death; but that was an opinion which prevailed everywhere, and it is more distinctive that he lays it down as a function of the civil magistrate 'to order and reform religion and to instruct subjects,' founding his argument mainly upon the Old Testament. According to Scripture, he argues, Aaron was entirely dependent upon Moses, who indeed supplied the priests with garments, anointed and washed them, and filled their hands with sacrifice. 'Who dare then be so bold as to affirm that the civil magistrate has nothing to do in matters of religion?'

By this time, however, Knox had begun to distrust the barons. In the Appellation he warns them that 'the same plagues will fall upon them as had fallen upon the English nobility, if they refuse to defend God's servants who called upon them for support'; and another letter addressed to the commonalty of Scotland shows that his eyes were already turned towards that new constituency which subsequently enabled him to defy the civil magistrate. He addresses the commonalty as his 'beloved brethren,' wishing them grace, mercy and peace, with the spirit of righteous judgment, and invites them to take part with the Estates and nobility in compelling the clergy to cease from tyranny and give account of their vain religion. To them, no less than to those in authority, does the care of religion belong, for, although there are providential differences in worldly station, 'yet in the hope of the life to come God hath made all equal.' Just men live by their own faith, not by the faith of their rulers; it appertains to every man who has a soul to provide for the true preaching of Christ Jesus, for God has made all equal, and in matters of religion 'requires no less of the subject, be he ever so poor, than of the prince and the rich man.' The letter proceeds to an appeal which

must be regarded as giving the keynote to a century and a half of Scottish Church history:

'This is that equality which is betwixt Kings and subjects, betwixt the most rich or noble and the poorest or men of lowest estate; to wit, that as the one is obliged to believe in heart, and with mouth to confess, the Lord Jesus to be the only Saviour of the world, so also is the other. . . . The poorest and most simple that in the days of this cruel persecution boldly doth confess Christ, is no less acceptable before God, neither is judged in His presence to have done any less in promoting Christ's cause, than the King who, by the sword and power which he hath received of God, rooteth out idolatry and so advanceth Christ's glory. . . . It is no less required of the subject than of the Prince to believe in Christ and to profess His true religion. And therefore I affirm that in God's presence it shall not excuse you to allege that ye were no chief rulers, and therefore that the care and reformation of religion did not appertain unto you. . . . Not only I, but diverse godly and learned men do offer unto you our labours, faithfully to instruct you in the ways of the Eternal, our God, and in the sincerity of Christ's Evangel, which this day, by the pestilent generation of Antichrist (I mean the Pope and his most ungodly clergy), are almost hid from the eyes of men. . . . We require nothing of you but that patiently ye will hear the revealed doctrine of salvation, and that ye will examine our reasons by the which we offer to prove the papistical religion to be abominable before God. And, last, we require that by your power the tyranny of those cruel beasts may be bridled, till we have uttered our minds in all matters this day debatable in religion. . . . Ye doubt what ye ought and may do in this so weighty a matter. In few words I will declare my conscience in the one and in the other. Ye ought to prefer the glory of God, the promoting of Christ's Evangel, and the saving of your souls to all things that be on earth; and ye, although ye be but subjects, may lawfully require of your superiors, be it King, Lords, rulers and powers, that they provide for you true preachers, and that they expel such as under the name of pastors devour and destroy the flock, not feeding the same as Christ Jesus hath commanded. And if in this point your superiors be negligent or pretend to maintain tyrants in their tyranny, most justly ye may provide true teachers for yourselves, in your cities, towns or villages, and defend them against all persecutors. . . . Ye may moreover withhold the fruits and profits, which your false bishops and clergy most unjustly receive of you, until such time as they be compelled to do their charge and duties, which is to preach unto you Christ Jesus truly, rightly to minister His sacraments according to His own institution, and to watch for the salvation of your souls. If God shall move your hearts in His true fear to begin to practise these things, and to demand and crave the same of your superiors, which most lawfully ye may do, then I doubt not that, of His great mercy and free grace, he shall illuminate the eyes of your minds and His undoubted verity shall be a lantern to your feet to guide and lead you in all the ways

which His godly wisdom doth approve. . . . It will not excuse you, dear brethren, in the presence of God to say, We were but simple subjects, we could not redress the faults and crimes of our rulers, bishops and clergy: we called for Reformation and wished for the same, but the lords' brothers were bishops, their sons were abbots, and the friends of great men had the possession of the Church, and so were we compelled to give obedience to all that they commanded. . . . As your princes and rulers are criminal with your bishops of all idolatry committed and of all the innocent blood that is shed for the testimony of Christ's truth, because they maintain them in their tyranny, so are you (I mean so many of you as give no plain confession to the contrary) criminal and guilty with your Princes and Rulers of the same crimes, because ye assist and maintain your Princes in their blind rage and give no declaration that their tyranny displeaseth you. . . . The iniquity of your bishops is more than manifest; their filthy lives infect the air; the innocent blood which they shed crieth vengeance in the ears of our God; the idolatry and abomination which openly they commit and without punishment maintain, doth corrupt and defile the whole land; and none amongst you doth unfeignedly study for any redress of such enormities. Will God, in this behalf, hold you as innocents? Be not deceived, dear brethren. God hath punished not only the proud tyrants, filthy persons and cruel murderers, but also such as with them did draw the yoke of iniquity, was it by flattering their offences, obeying their unjust commandments or in winking at their manifest iniquity. . . . God give you the spirit of wisdom and open unto you the knowledge of Himself, by the means of His dear Son, by the which ye may attain to the esperance and hope that, after the troubles of this transitorious life, ye may be partakers of that glorious inheritance, which is prepared for such as refuse themselves and fight under the banner of Christ Jesus in the day of this His battle; that in deep consideration of the same ye may learn to prefer the invisible and eternal joys to the vain pleasures that are present.'[1]

This letter was written on July 14, and before it can have reached Scotland there were signs that the 'commonalty' had taken courage. Douglas, Harlaw, Methven and Willock now preached publicly and with acceptance, administering baptism and celebrating marriages.[2] It is at this stage that Quintin Kennedy describes them as 'masterless dogs' who claimed an Apostolic title to teach and to preach.[3] They were summoned to appear before the Regent

[1] Knox, *Works*, iv. 523-538. The importance of this appeal to the people should be noted and contrasted with the policy of the leaders of Reformation in England, who concealed religious issues from the people at large.—Gairdner, *Lollardy*, iv. 371, 399.

[2] *Statuta*, ii. 174.

[3] See page 38; *Compendius Tractive*, p. 125.

at Holyrood on July 19,[1] and their adherents, who prepared to accompany them, were banished from Edinburgh. Some west-countrymen, however, headed by James Chalmers of Gaitgyrth, with whom Knox had lodged for a time in 1556, went with the preachers to Holyrood, where they had audience of Regent and bishops. Knox's account of the interview is of the kind which admits of no abstract or paraphrase :

'The gentlemen began to complain upon their strange entertainment, considering that Her Grace had found them so faithful and obedient in all things lawful. While the Regent began to craft, Chalmers said, Madam, we know that this is the malice and device of those 'jefwellis' (gaol-birds), and of that bastard (meaning the Bishop of St. Andrews) that stands by you : we avow to God we shall make ane day of it. They oppress us and our tenants for feeding of their idle bellies ; they trouble our preachers and would murder them and us. Shall we suffer this any longer? Na, Madam ; it shall not be. And therewith every man put on his steel bonnet. Then was heard nothing on the Queen's part but, My joys, my hearts, what ails you? Me means no evil to you nor to your preachers. The bishops shall do you no wrong. Ye are all my loving subjects. Me know nothing of this proclamation. The day of your preachers shall be discharged,[2] and me will hear the controversy that is betwixt the bishops and you ; they shall do you no wrong. My Lords, said she to the bishops, I forbid you to trouble either them or their preachers. And unto the gentlemen who were wondrously commoved she turned again and said, O my hearts, should ye not love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your mind? And should ye not love your neighbours as yourselves? With these and the like fair words she kept the bishops from buffets at that time.'[3]

If Buchanan and Lesley are accurate, the outcome of the

[1] In *A Historie* the order of events is somewhat different from that given by Knox. The preachers are said to have attended at Holyrood in July, to have been set free under promise to return on eight days' notice, and thereafter to have preached privately in Edinburgh, but publicly 'where they might without occasion of sedition or great trouble. . . . The faithful in Dundee exceeded all the rest in zeal and boldness.'—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 54. On the date of the supplication given in *A Historie*, see page 81, n. 5.

[2] *I.e.*, the summons shall be cancelled or postponed.

[3] Knox, *Works*, i. 257-8 ; Calderwood, *History*, i. 344-5. Lang (*History*, ii. 43) transfers this episode to September 1, naming Lesley and Buchanan as his authorities, but neither of these writers narrates the episode at all. Lesley gives two inconsistent accounts of the Holyrood meeting; in the one he calls it a 'convention or provincial council of the whole prelates and clergy held about the end of July,' in the other 'a parliament' ; there was no meeting either of Provincial Council or of parliament in July.—Buchanan, *History*, bk. xvi., c. 20 ; *Lesley* (S.T.S.), ii. 383 ; Bann. Club ed., p. 266.

discussion was less favourable to the Reformers than the above narrative suggests, and the preachers were ordered to make a public recantation on St. Giles' Day (September 1); but when the day came round, the populace broke out in a riot which Knox describes in his most graphic style.[1] The priests had borrowed an image of the saint to replace the one destroyed a year before, but their procession was broken up by a High Street mob, the image was shattered, the priests after a faint resistance fled in terror, and the proceedings against the preachers were abandoned. The Regent made some attempts to discover the leaders in the outrage, but at this stage, as we have seen,[2] she was almost forced into toleration by her eagerness to secure the Crown Matrimonial for the Dauphin. The Lords of the Congregation became aggressive, and resolved to claim religious liberty from parliament, which had been convened for November 27. The claim was embodied in a very moderate memorial, which went not beyond urging respectfully that power to deal with heretics should be taken out of the hands of churchmen, and that none should be condemned who were not proved, after a fair trial, to have erred from the 'manifest word of God,' until the controversy between Protestants and Romanists should be decided by a General Council.[3] When parliament met, the Regent suppressed the memorial; and the Lords, while protesting against the concession of the crown matrimonial, lodged a protest with parliament, alleging that they held themselves answerable to God alone in matters of conscience, and that their sole concern was for the removal of abuses in religion, with the significant statement that, if abuses were not removed by law, the diversity of religion might give rise to tumult and uproar and lead to a violent reformation, for which the blame would not be due to the petitioners.[4] Although parliament refused to register the 'protestations,' the Regent

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 258-261.
[2] See page 23.
[3] *Ibid.*, i. 310-312.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 312-314. Lang (*History*, ii. 44) confuses the 'petition' with the protest; the petition did not reach parliament; it was the 'protestations' that parliament refused to register.

soothed the Lords with fair promises,[1] and so misled them as to her intentions that they wrote to Calvin asking him, as the recognized chief of the Reformers, to exhort her 'to follow constantly that which godly she had begun.'[2] The publication of the Beggars' Summons on January 1 led to no retaliatory measures. In a letter written six days later, Peter Martyr, the Zürich Reformer, reports that the Scots 'have written to the King of France that they wish to enjoy pure religion, and will be quiet if they obtain it; they have obtained the Gospel; they have public preaching and due administration of the sacraments. These they have not obtained by the public law or by the Queen's commandment, but the people have taken them.'[3] The extent to which liberty had been secured appeared a few weeks later, when a proposal was made for a formal debate upon the mass, to be held at Ayr between Quintin Kennedy and Willock the preacher. The proposal came to nothing, being wrecked upon the standing question of authority; Kennedy claiming that twelve of the early Fathers might be quoted as authorities, while Willock insisted that appeal must be made to the Bible alone. The negotiations disclose the significant fact that Kennedy claimed that the debate should be conducted in private before selected hearers; whereas Willock urged that it should be in the parish church, and was accused of attempting to overawe his opponent by taking with him a force of four or five hundred men.[4] For a month or two it seemed as if the Reformers would secure full religious liberty without a political revolution.

When in February the Regent instructed the Primate to convene the Provincial Council,[5] she also convened the Estates 'to advise for some reformation in religion,'[6] and

[1] 'She promised to the Earls of Argyll, Marischal, Morton and Glencairn, with the Prior of St. Andrews, being accompanied with many nobles and gentlemen, that she would be content that all such as favoured God's Word should have liberty to live after their own consciences.'—Kirkaldy to Percy, *State Papers, Foreign* (1558-9), p. 278.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 315.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[4] Keith, *Affairs*, iii. 393-404.

[5] See page 43 n.

[6] According to *A Historie*, both the Estates and the Provincial Council were convened some time before February 2, the Regent being alarmed by the prospect of uproar.

the terms of both notices indicate that she still intended to conciliate the Lords of the Congregation. The change in her policy was made suddenly,[1] while both the Estates and the Provincial Council were in session, and it was, as we have seen,[2] the result of the agreement reached on the Continent by Roman Catholic powers that Protestantism must be suppressed.[3] On the 23rd of March she commanded her whole household to participate in mass, issued a summons to the preachers, and published an edict throughout the country that no one under penalty of death should preach or minister the sacraments without episcopal licence. The Reformers (the 'faithful') who were meeting daily in Edinburgh remonstrated, but she proudly said, 'In despite of you and of your ministers both, they shall be banished out of Scotland, albeit they preached as truly as ever did St. Paul.' In amazement they sent Glencairn and the Sheriff of Ayr 'to reason with her; to whom she said that it became not subjects to burden their princes with promises further than it pleaseth them to keep the same.'[4] They answered this so stoutly that she adjourned the summons to the preachers, who thereupon dispersed and continued their preaching with increased zeal. Her anger broke out when she heard that the royal burgh of Perth had embraced the truth. Sending for the provost, Lord Ruthven, she

[1] On February 9, the Regent issued a proclamation which forbade eating flesh in Lent, with death penalty. Yet both Knox and Kirkaldy allege that her outbreak was totally unexpected. 'She began to spue forth and disclose the latent venom of her double heart and to look frowardly to all such as she knew did favour the Evangel.'—Knox, *Works*, i. 315. 'She uttered her deceitful mind, having now declared that she would be enemy to all them that should not live after her religion.'—*State Papers, Foreign* (1558-9), p. 278.

[2] See page 23.

[3] Bellesheim (ii. 262) connects the change with the arrival of a French ambassador; Father Pollen confirms this, although he quaintly suggests that the threats of the French were only 'brave words intended to salve their wounded honour.'—*Papal Negotiations*, p. xxxv. Lang (*Knox*, pp. 94 ff.) enlarges upon the fact that the Regent's severity began some weeks before the arrival of the ambassador, and blames 'older historians' for having ascribed undue weight to the embassy. Yet the change in her policy was certainly due to the compact which was arranged months before April 2, when the treaty of Cateau Cambrésis was signed. Froude writes of the arrangement as becoming 'final' on March 12.—*History*, vi. 176.

[4] Knox, *Works*, i. 316. The terms of the Regent's edict are uncertain: see *Statuta*, I. clvii; *A Historie* (*Wodrow Miscellany*), i. p. 56; M'Crie, *Knox*, p. 155; Lang, *Knox*, p. 92.

ordered him 'to suppress all such religion.' But he replied that, although he could make the citizens bend before Her Grace by threats of death, he could not promise to cause them do against their conscience. At Dundee the provost refused to arrest the preacher Methven, and commissioners, whom she despatched to enforce the observance of mass at Perth, Dundee and Montrose, were completely baffled. Highly incensed, she summoned all the preachers to appear before her at Stirling on the 10th of May, and the Congregation, on their part, recognized that a crisis had arrived and agreed that 'the gentlemen of every country should accompany their preachers to the day and place appointed.'[1]

That the crisis was a great one for Scotland was fully recognized by Knox, the man who more than any other had imparted vigour and unity to the Reformers. When the death of Mary Tudor made it possible for exiles to return to England, the English congregation at Geneva was dissolved. Knox left for Scotland at the beginning of 1559,[2] but his journey was interrupted at Dieppe by the refusal of Queen Elizabeth's ministers to allow him to pass through England. Although he had no thought of remaining in England, he wished to visit his congregations at Berwick and Newcastle, and he had private communications to make to Sir William Cecil.[3] Elizabeth, however, who seems from the first to have thoroughly disliked the fervid Protestantism of Knox, was specially indignant with his *Blast* against the rule of women, and he was delayed for more than two months at Dieppe, where he gave himself to preaching—preaching so effective that his hearers formed themselves into a Protestant congregation which became an important centre of the French Reformed Church.[4] His letters written at Dieppe show that on subjects on which he had hesitated

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 317.

[2] He had left Geneva before February 7.—*Ibid.*, vi. 11.

[3] Although Knox does not specify these 'communications,' their tenor cannot be doubted. Already negotiations were in process for a religious compact between the anti-Church party in Scotland and the English government: see page 23.

[4] On March 1 'abjuration of the errors of the Roman Church and profession of the truth of the Gospel was made by the hands of Sieur Jean Knox' and others.—Daval, *Histoire de la Réformation à Dieppe*, pp. 10, 11.

his purpose was now matured. In one letter, for example, he strongly advises a lady who had consulted him to avoid those compromises to which the English Reformers were turning, and intimates emphatically that he 'will never counsel any one to use' the English Prayer Book, which is stained, he says, with 'the dregs of papistry.'[1] 'The time has come,' he says, 'when Christ Jesus and Satan His adversary are at plain defiance. . . . The quality of this time will not affray him, although corporal death should be his reward.' In a very masterful letter to Cecil,[2] he warns that eminent statesman against 'following the world,' and avers that the safety of England depends wholly upon the 'simplicity, sincerity and fervency' of her religion. He claims permission, 'such as even the Turks do commonly grant,' to pass through England[3] in order that he may 'repair to his own country which now beginneth to thirst for Christ's truth.' This claim being repeatedly rejected, he recognized that 'England had refused him,' and sailed from Dieppe on the 22nd of April, landing at Leith on the 2nd of May. A letter written on the day after his arrival shows how thoroughly he was aware of the greatness of the crisis:

'These few lines are to signify unto you, dear Sister, that it hath pleased the merciful providence of my Heavenly Father to conduct me to Edinburgh, uncertain as yet what God shall further work in this country, except that I see the battle shall be great, for Satan rageth even to the uttermost. And I am come (I praise my God) even in the brunt of the battle; for my fellow-preachers[4] have a day appointed to answer before the Queen Regent, the tenth of this instant, where I intend, if God impede not, also to be present, by life, by death, or else by both, to glorify His godly name who thus mercifully hath heard my long cries. Assist me, Sister, with your prayers, that now I shrink not when the battle approacheth.'[5]

From Edinburgh Knox proceeded at once[6] to Dundee,

[1] *Works*, vi. 12.

[2] *Ibid.*, vi. 15-20.

[3] Morel, French Reformer, implored Calvin to keep this firebrand out of England lest all should be spoiled.—*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 573.

[4] According to Lesley (Bann. Club. ed., p. 271) Knox himself was one of the preachers summoned 'immediately after April 10.' But Knox was then at Dieppe.

[5] Knox, *Works*, vi. 21.

[6] According to *A Historie*, p. 57, Knox was declared an outlaw by the Regent on the third day after his landing.

where the adherents of the preachers were rallying, and by his preaching 'put more life into his hearers than five hundred trumpets continually blustering.' [1]

NOTE P. Page 56.

TILL OUR GUDE MAN.

Till our gud man, till our gud man,
Keip faith and lufe, till our gud man.

For our gude man in heuin dois regne
In gloir and blis without ending,
Quhar Angellis singis euer *Osan* [2]
In laude and pryse [3] of our gude man.

Our gude man desyris thré thingis,
Ane hart, quhair fra contritioun springis,
Syne lufe [4] him best, our Saulis that wan,
Quhen we war loste fra our gude man.

And our gude man, that euer was kynde,
Requyris of vs ane faithfull mynde,
Syne cheritabill be with euerie clan,
For lufe onlie of our gude man.

Zit [5] our gude man requyris moir,
To geue na' Creature his gloir,
And gif we do, (do quhat we can),
We salbe loste fra our gude man.

And our gude man he promeist sure,
To euerie faithful Creature,
His greit mercy, that, now or than,
Will call for grace at our gude man.

Adame that our Foirfather was,
He loste vs all for his Trespas,
Quhais brukkill banis [6] we may sair ban,
That gart [7] vs lose our awin gude man.

Zit our gude man, gracious and gude,
For our Saluatioun sched his blude,
Upon the Croce, quhair thair began,
The mercyfulness of our gude man.

[1] Quoted by Pollard, *Political History*, p. 225.
[2] Hosanna. [3] praise. [4] love.
[5] yet. [6] whose brittle bones. [7] caused.

This is the blude did vs refresche,
This is the blude that mon vs wesche,[1]
The blude that from his hart furth ran,
Maid vs fré airis[2] till[3] our gude man.

Now lat vs pray, baith day and hour,
Till Christ our onlie Mediatour,
Till saif[4] vs on the day that quhan[5]
We sal be Jugeit be our gude man.

HAY TRIX, TRYME GO TRIX.

THE Paip, that Pagane full of pryde,
He hes vs blindit lang,
For quhair the blind the blind dois gyde,
Na wounder baith ga wrang ;
Lyke Prince and King, he led the Regne,
Of all Iniquitie :
Hay trix, tryme go trix, vnder the grene [wod tré].

Bot his abominatioun,
The Lord hes brocht to lycht ;
His Popische pryde, and thrinfald[6] Crowne,
Almaist hes loste thair mycht.
His plak Pardonis,[7] ar bot lardonis,[8]
Of new fund vanitie.
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

His Cardinallis hes cause to murne,[9]
His Bischoppis borne aback,
His Abbotis gat ane vncouth[10] turne,
Quhen schauelingis[11] went to sack,
With Burges wyffis thay led thair lyues,
And fure[12] better nor we,
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

His Carmelitis, and Jacobinis,
His Dominikis had greit do,
His Cordeleris,[13] and Augustinis,
Sanct Frances of ordour to ;[14]
Thay sillie Freiris, mony zeiris,[15]
With babling blerit[16] our E,
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

[1] wash.
[2] free heirs.
[3] to.
[4] to save.
[5] when.
[6] threefold.
[7] pardons sold for a plack.
[8] deceits.
[9] mourn.
[10] strange.
[11] shavelings, monks.
[12] fare.
[13] Franciscans.
[14] order too.
[15] years.
[16] blinded.

The Sisteris gray, befoir this day,
Did crune[1] within thair cloister,
Thay feit[2] ane Freir, thair keyis to beir,
The Feind ressaue[3] the foster.
Syne, in the mirk, he weill culd wirk,
. . . . . .
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

The blind Bischop, he culd nocht preiche,
For playing with the lassis,
The sillie Freir behulffit to fleiche,[4]
For almous that he assis,[5]
The Curat, his Creid he culd nocht reid,
Schame fall the cumpanie.
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

The Bischop wald nocht[6] wed ane wyfe,
The Abbot not persew ane,
Thinkand it was ane lustie lyfe,
Ilk day to haif ane new ane,
In euerie place, ane uncouth face,
His lust to satisfie.
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c

The Persoun[7] wald nocht haif ane hure,[8]
Bot twa, and they war bony,
The Vicar, (thocht he was pure),
Behuifit to haif as mony,
The pareis Preist,[9] that brutall beist,
. . . . . .
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

Of Scotland well the Freiris of Faill,
The lymmerie[10] lang hes lestit,
The Monkis of Melros maid gude kaill,
On Frydayis quhen thay fastit,
The sillie Nunnis . . . .
. . . . . .
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

Of lait I saw thir lymmaris[11] stand,
Lyke mad men at mischeif,
Thinking to get the vpper hand,
Thay luke efter releif,
Bot all in vaine, go tell thame plaine,
That day will neuer be.
Hay trix, tryme go trix, &c.

[1] croon.
[2] feed, hired.
[3] receive.
[4] behoved to flatter
[5] alms that he begs.
[6] would not.
[7] parson.
[8] whore.
[9] parish priest.
[10] villany.
[11] worthless fellows.

O Jesu! gif[1] thay thocht greit glie,[2]
To sé Goddis word downe smorit,[3]
The Congregatioun maid to flie,[4]
Hypocrisie restorit,
With Messis sung and bellis rung,
To thair Idolatrie;
Marie, God thank zow, we sall gar brank zow,[5]
Befoir that tyme trewlie.

[1] if. [2] great glee. [3] smothered.
[4] made to flee. [5] have you curbed.

CHAPTER XXVI

'THE UPROAR FOR RELIGION'[1]

May 1559—August 1560

Importance of the crisis—Knox's personality and leadership—Outbreak at Perth—The Regent's duplicity—Triumph of the Reformers—Cleansing of churches—Its motive and extent—Question of national liberty—Attitude of foreign powers—Elizabeth, Knox and Cecil—Appeal for English aid—The Regent in power—Policy of Elizabeth—Growth of the Congregation—Vicissitudes of fortune—The power of Knox—Intrigues and success of the Regent—Help from England—Berwick—Death of the Regent—Edinburgh—Claims of the Congregation—The Confession of Faith—Parliamentary enactments—Peaceful character of the Scottish Reformation.

THE year which followed the arrival of Knox is the most important in the history of the Scottish Church and the Scottish nation. Although the agencies of the Roman Church were all but extinct and its fabric lay in hopeless disorder, the new religious life, which for thirty years had been permeating the land, was not yet organic, and it was not yet clear what shape its organism would take—what relation it would bear to existing Church institutions and to the nation as a nation. There was a still graver political uncertainty. Two powerful nations had in turn strained their energies in seeking to master Scotland, and at the beginning of 1559 it seemed uncertain whether Scotland was destined to be a province of France, an appanage of England, or an independent kingdom. Before the end of August 1560, both the religious and the political questions were practically settled by developments in which political

[1] Pitscottie, *History*, 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1778.

and religious influences were inseparably combined. The combination is one which must be frankly recognized. The history of the Church and that of the nation were for a time identical, and writers who ascribe the issue exclusively to religion are as far from the truth as those who take cognizance only of the secular forces which were at work.

No year of Scottish history has been so important for other nations. It is indeed the one year when Scotland has had a direct and determining influence upon the development of Western Europe. A small country with a population of not more than half a million, in parts still uncivilized and in parts fast-bound by feudalism, it became the centre of a crisis in which the destinies of England, France and Spain were involved. Was England to be vanquished and overborne by the Catholic Powers or to assert an independence by which the balance of nations and the permanence of the Reformation as a political force would be preserved? So it was that religious movements, which in themselves may seem trivial and which were in truth provincial, were recognized as momentous. 'Suddenly all eyes were turned to a backward country,' where 'the fate of the Protestant Reformation was being decided, and the creed of unborn nations in undiscovered lands was being determined.'[1]

Many strong personalities appeared in the struggle and contributed to its result. Queen Elizabeth and her Secretary, Sir William Cecil, were great personages; the Guises, and specially Mary of Lorraine, were possessed of high abilities; in Scotland, Maitland of Lethington and James Stewart ('Lord James') were men whose dissimilar qualities would have secured distinction for them in any land. But the individuality which left the strongest impress upon events and determined, or at least regulated, their course was that of Knox. The native powers of Knox—his sonorous, trenchant and pictorial eloquence, his swift and sure insight into character, and his instinct for the requirements and possibilities of a situation had been

[1] F. W. Maitland, *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 550.

matured in an unusually varied experience; he had reached the conviction that a thorough reformation was impossible without a sweeping and complete change, and that 'the dregs of papistry,' as he styled some doctrines of the Lutherans and some usages to which the English Reformers clung, were poisonous. But that conviction was shared by many other Reformers, and already it had been set forth vigorously in Scotland. He owed his unique forcefulness to his concentration upon the interests of religion. His religious ideas were in many respects those of the Old rather than of the New Testament; but for him they were supreme, and he pursued them with unflagging zeal. Keenly as every step of his career has been criticized, no competent critic has charged him with political or personal ambitions. Amidst diplomatic churchmen and statesmen, he stood out as the one man of first-rate ability to whom religion was all in all. With this conviction there was combined an unswerving belief that the cause he had at heart would triumph. Frequently he was depressed about his own future; but the depression rarely if ever passed into dubiety about the future of his cause. This assurance sometimes led him to claim prophetic power, but the claim never went beyond forecasts of the discomfiture of his opponents, and in his normal life it imparted to him an air of mastery with monarchs, and secured for him a place of leadership. Not one of the able and ambitious men with whom he worked, except perhaps Maitland, seems to have regarded his leadership with jealousy.

Before Knox landed at Leith, the Regent, as we have seen, had summoned the preachers to appear before her on the 10th of May. He passed at once[1] to Dundee, which since Wishart's time had been a chief centre of the new faith, and there joined a company of Reformers who resolved to escort the preachers to Stirling *en masse* in order to show the Regent with how large a body of her subjects

[1] It is possible that a special sentence of outlawry was passed against Knox on his arrival, although for this there is only one authority.—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 57. The sentence passed against him in 1555 (see page 74) had not been revoked.

she had to deal. They proclaimed a rally to be held at Perth, and about 5000 responded. Although they were unarmed, they recognized that the approach of so large a force might have the semblance of rebellion and despatched Erskine of Dun to Stirling to explain that their only purpose was to support the preachers in their claim for liberty. The gathering included the Lords of the Congregation, to whom Knox acted as Secretary for the next five months, besides preaching almost daily from the day of their arrival at Perth. His was the pen, as well as the voice, by which all proceedings were inspired and shaped. What passed between the Regent and Erskine is not quite clear. According to one authority, she gave promises so fair that some of the Congregation left Perth thinking that the purpose of the rally had been secured; according to another, she proved obdurate, and declared Erskine himself an outlaw.[1] But she certainly outlawed the preachers for their non-appearance, and when Erskine reported upon his mission at Perth, the 'multitude was inflamed.' On the following day (May 11), Knox preached vehemently in the parish church (the Kirk of the Holy Cross of St John the Baptist) against 'idolatry,' and at the close of the sermon a rash priest proceeded to celebrate mass. A young boy, possessed by a spirit which the Perth children had previously displayed,[2] shouted out in protest; the priest struck him; the boy flung a stone which missed the priest but broke an image; and immediately the congregation began to 'cast stones and put hands to the tabernacle, and to all other monuments of idolatry, which they despatched.'

[1] There are four or five contemporary narratives, two of them by Knox-Croft, who was at Berwick at the time, wrote that Erskine proposed a public disputation between the preachers and the clergy, but his despatch is too loosely written to merit confidence; Lesley says that Erskine was sent to beg the Regent not to impose a penalty on the preachers in their absence. In *A Historie of the Estate of Scotland*, he is said to have remonstrated with the Regent for outlawing the preachers. Knox's two accounts, although varying in detail, both charge the Regent with duplicity. Knox is followed in this by Buchanan, Spottiswoode, Hill Burton and Hume Brown. Lang (*Knox*, pp. 275-9) seeks to clear her from the charge. That she broke faith with the Congregation a fort. night later is certain.—*State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, p. 263; Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 400; *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 57; Knox, *Works*, i. 317; vi. 25; Hume Brown, *Knox*, ii. 6.

[2] See vol. i. 460.

When the news of the outbreak spread, 'the whole multitude convened, not of the gentlemen, neither of them that were earnest professors, but of the rascal multitude, who, finding nothing to do in that church, did run without deliberation to the Gray and Black Friars; and, notwithstanding that they had within them very strong guards, yet were their gates incontinent burst up. The first invasion was upon the idolatry, and thereafter the common people began to seek some spoil . . . the spoil was permitted to the poor; for the preachers had before threatened all men that for covetousness' sake none should put their hand to such a reformation, so that no honest man was enriched thereby the value of a groat. . . . The Prior of Charter-house was permitted to take away with him as much gold and silver as he was well able to carry. So were men's consciences before beaten with the Word, that they had no respect to their own particular profit, but only to abolish idolatry, the places and monuments thereof; in which they were so busy and so laborious that within two days these three great places, monuments of idolatry, to wit the Gray and Black thieves (friaries) and the Charter-house, a building of a wondrous cost and greatness, were so destroyed that the walls only did remain of these great edifications.'[1] When the Regent heard of the outbreak she vowed that she would destroy Perth and its inhabitants, but the Congregation, despising her threat, dispersed, leaving Knox 'to instruct the citizens, because they were young and rude in Christ'; but, when they learned that she had summoned her French guard and was marching upon Perth, they returned, fortified the city and issued three manifestoes addressed to the Regent, to the 'pestilent prelates and their shavelings,' and to the nobility. The first two define the claims and the intentions of the Reformers. Although loyal subjects of the Crown, they claimed 'to live in that peace and liberty which Christ Jesus has purchased by His blood, to have His Word truly preached and the Holy Sacraments rightly ministered'; they were reluctant to proceed to extremities, but they were

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 320; see below.

ready 'to take the sword of just defence against all that should pursue them for the matter of religion.' The address to the nobility, which was specially intended for noblemen like Argyll and Lord James, who although at heart Protestants still adhered to the Regent, disavowed any seditious or rebellious purpose, and declared that the question at issue was between true and false religion—a question which the Reformers were ready to submit to any impartial tribunal. The nobles must not take refuge in the plea that they were obeying and maintaining the civil authority, for 'there is a great difference between the authority which is God's ordinance and the persons of those who are placed in authority.' Should they be faint-hearted and refuse to stand for the truth, they would be excommunicated from the society and the sacraments of 'the Church now by God's mighty power erected in Scotland.'[1]

Meanwhile the Regent's forces, numbering 8000, advanced to Auchterarder; attempts at mediation by Argyll[2] and Lord James led only to recriminations, and battle was imminent when the Regent was checked by the arrival of a force of 2500 Reformers under the Earl of Glencairn, summoned from the south-west of Scotland, where the reforming spirit had been strong since the days of Lollardy. On May 28, an agreement, or 'Appointment,' was made, that the Congregation should disperse, and the Regent entered the city on condition that no citizen should be punished for any share taken in the recent outbreak, that the Reforming movement should be allowed to 'go forward,' and that the Regent should leave no French soldiers as a garrison.[3] The Congregation suspected that the Regent would not keep her part of the Appointment, but Argyll and Lord James

[1] The three manifestoes are printed in Knox, *Works*, i. 326-36.

[2] Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 59.

[3] There are slightly different versions of the Appointment. The above is given by Knox in his *History* (*Works*, i. 341-356). In a letter to Mrs. Locke he said that no person was to be 'troubled for anything done either in religion or in down-casting of places till the sentence of the Estates had decided the controversy, that no French soldiers should be left in Perth, nor any idolatry erected, or alteration made within the town.'—*Ibid.*, vi. 24. Pitscottie (ii. 149-152) says that no Frenchmen were to come within three miles of the town. Hill Burton gives a blended version from Keith, etc.—*History*, iii. 356.

assured them that if she 'did break any jot thereof they with their whole powers would assist and concur with their brethren in all times to come.' This assurance was sealed by a Covenant, signed on May 31, by these two noblemen along with Glencairn, Boyd, Ochiltree and the Sheriff of Ayr, in which they bound themselves 'in a constant amity, unity and fellowship to destroy and put away all things that dishonour God's Name, so that He may be truly and purely worshipped, and to spare neither labour, goods, substance, body nor life in maintaining the liberty of the whole Congregation.'[1] Satisfied with this pledge, the Congregation broke up, proving their sense of liberty by cleansing parish churches on their homeward way: but the Regent within two days of her entrance into Perth had tossed her pledges to the winds. Mass was reinstated in the churches, Reformers were deposed from the magistracy, and the promise that the city should not be garrisoned by Frenchmen was evaded by the instalment of French mercenaries of Scottish birth. When Lord James and Argyll remonstrated, she replied that she was 'not bound to keep promises to heretics,' but the answer cost her dear, for the two lords, with the Earl of Menteith, Murray of Tullibardine and Lord Ruthven, loyal to their Covenant, abandoned her cause finally. The accession to the Congregation was invaluable, and there was equal importance in the confirmation of the idea that the word of the Regent could not be trusted.[2]

Under the leadership of Argyll and Lord James the Congregation turned to St. Andrews, the ancient ecclesias-

[1] The Covenanters are said to have taken the oath with ropes round their necks, to betoken their readiness to be hanged, if they did not hang their enemies.—Pitscottie, ii. 149.

[2] The French Chamberlain, on June 13, 1559, when giving Sir James Melville a commission, said, 'I have intelligence that the Queen Regent hath not kept all things promised to the Scots.'—Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 51 (3rd ed.). On April 6, 1560, Randolph wrote of 'her long experience of craft and subtilty.'—*State Papers* (*Scotland and Mary*), p. 348. Her grandson, James VI, wrote: 'I durst not play fast and loose with my word. . . . Laud knows not the stomach of the Scots; but I ken the story of my grandmother that after she was inveigled to break her promise made to some mutineers at a Perth meeting, she never saw good day, but from thence, being much beloved before, was despised by her people.'—Hill Burton, *History*, vi. 339 (ed. 1870).

tical capital of the kingdom, 'for reformation to be made there.'[1] On June 11, Knox preached in the parish church in thankful fulfilment of the hope he had expressed when toiling in the galleys.[2] The Archbishop, indignant at this outrage upon the citadel of his cause, inhibited him with threats which gained reality from the fact that the pursuing forces of the Regent had occupied Falkland, about twenty miles distant. Knox's comrades hesitated, but he himself insisted upon using 'the occasion which God in His mercy had offered.' For three days he preached in the presence of the 'doctors' and the magistrates, setting forth the 'corruption of the papistrie' and the duty of ejecting buyers and sellers from the temple; and on June 14 the magistrates, with the consent of the Prior and Sub-prior, formally resolved to 'remove all monuments of idolatry, which also they did with expedition.' Crucifixes, pictures and vestments were collected, and, with a sense of retributive justice, burnt on the spot of the martyrdom of Walter Myln.[3] When the Archbishop, who had fled, reported the proceedings at Falkland, the Regent was disposed to follow advice given her by the Cardinal of Lorraine to 'cut off the heads of all the Protestant rebels,' but a battle would have been precarious, and an eight days' armistice was arranged on Cupar Moor in the hope of making a permanent truce. But the Regent insisted that there must be no public preaching, and the Congregation were resolved to persevere. Before the eight days were past[4] she had crossed the Forth and they had advanced to Perth, which they proceeded to set free (on June 25) from its garrison of Franco-Scots. From Perth they marched to Stirling and Linlithgow, and on June 28

[1] On the way to St. Andrews Knox preached at Crail and Anstruther.—Knox, *Works*, i. 347.

[2] See page 55.

[3] Knox, *Works*, i. 350. Hay Fleming has shown that the accounts given in Lyon's *History of St. Andrews* of the destruction of Church fabrics at St. Andrews are grossly exaggerated, and, in regard to the cathedral, quite untrue. The cathedral was in use after the Reformation.—*The Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 364-372.

[4] There was a second 'cleansing' of Lindores Abbey at this time, and the Regent failed to send, as she promised, commissioners to St. Andrews. Thus the armistice was broken on both sides.—Lang, *Knox*, pp. 126-7.

or 29[1] entered Edinburgh, from which the Regent had turned aside to Dunbar, awaiting reinforcements from France. The fickle Edinburgh mob had anticipated the arrival of the Reformers by making havoc of the friaries,[2] and no resistance was offered when, on June 30, Knox occupied the pulpit of St. Giles'. On the following day he preached at Holyrood Abbey, and on July 7 the congregation of Edinburgh, meeting in the Tolbooth, elected him minister of Edinburgh.[3] The Reformers took possession of the Mint seals,[4] resolved after deliberation that monuments of idolatry should be suppressed in Edinburgh and 'the places next adjacent,' sealed their proceedings by a new Covenant and sent a formal justification of their actions to the Regent.

The so-called 'cleansing' of churches, which was carried out at Perth, St. Andrews and Edinburgh, was a leading feature of Knox's plan, and deserves therefore more than a cursory notice. In earlier chapters we have seen that the beautiful abbeys and priories, specially those of the Borderland, had suffered terribly in war, that parish churches had been shamefully neglected by rectors and vicars, and that from 1545 onwards destructive attacks had been made here and there upon obnoxious centres of monastic life. But a new force was now brought into play. To Knox it was a matter of principle that every trace of a worship which to him seemed utterly corrupt should be obliterated. In England, and at Geneva and at Frankfort he had seen misunderstanding, confusion and strife through attempts

[1] The day is uncertain, owing to irregularity in the dating of Knox's letters. One letter is dated from Perth, June 28, another from Edinburgh, June 25.—*Works*, vi. 30, 32. The Reformers were certainly in Edinburgh before June 29.—Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 61.

[2] Knox, *Works*, i. 363.

[3] Several recent writers have followed Hume Brown (*Knox*, ii. 27) in saying that Knox was 'minister of the Tolbooth.' There was no Tolbooth congregation; the Tolbooth was the Council House. In Edinburgh, as in other centres of the Reformation, there was only one 'Congregation,' even when several places of worship were in use. The Edinburgh Congregation must of course be distinguished from the Congregation of Christ Jesus in Scotland.—Knox, *Works*, i. 388: *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 62, 63.

[4] The Regent was frequently charged by patriots with deteriorating the coinage.

to retain Roman symbols in 'Reformed' worship, and he had reached the sober conclusion that the 'dregs of papistrie' must be cast out of the Church as poisonous. Permeated by the spirit of Hebrew law and prophecy, he had continually in mind the ruthless war waged by the chosen nation against idolatry, and the frequency with which they had incurred judgment by their neglect of the second commandment of the decalogue. The traffic of the Roman priesthood in the sacraments, and specially in the mass, was in his eyes like the sin of those who bought and sold in the Temple, whom Jesus had driven before Him with indignation, saying, 'Take these things hence'; and he knew how in the early centuries martyrs had turned from graven images with loathing, and the first missionaries had led their converts in unsparing campaigns against idols. Moreover, he deliberately judged that the presence of symbolic figures in places of worship presented a temptation to those who were 'rude in Christ,' and that they were not safe from the risk of lapsing until the temptation was removed.[1] Accordingly he regarded it as a primary duty of those who abandoned Romanism to purge their churches not only for their own sakes but in the interest of their weaker brethren and of the community as a whole, and he regarded this purging as a triumph of pure Christianity.[2] He desired indeed, like Calvin,[3] that the proceeding should be authoritative and systematic, distinguishing carefully between outbreaks of the 'rascal multitude' and the considered action

[1] Pitscottie, who, although an inaccurate writer, reflects prevailing sentiment, alleges that Knox was caused 'to conceive a prayer to God Almighty to direct them to do that which might serve most to the glory of God and good of His kirk. Then they concluded to pass and demolish the Charter-house.'—Pitscottie, ii. 145-6.

[2] Spottiswoode repeats with hesitation a 'report' that Knox said in one of his sermons, 'The sure way to banish the rooks is to pull down their nests,' and Bishop Quadra says that the Scottish preacher said that 'if they want to do away with the rabbits they must destroy the warrens'; but these sayings do not at all represent the sentiment of Knox.—Spottiswoode, *History*, i. 373; *Spanish Calendar, Elizabeth*, i. 210.

[3] In 1561 Calvin suspended a preacher for a private crusade against crosses, altars and images, but he held that idols should be overthrown by every Christian 'in his own house, and in public by those whom God hath armed with authority.'—*Corpus Reformatorum*, xlvi. 609; xlvii. 409-421; or *Lettres Françaises*, t. ii. p. 416.

of the Congregation.[1] Although he showed a grim satisfaction when the latter was anticipated by the former, he disavowed responsibility for their action, and in particular took great pains to prove that the leaders of the Congregation attempted to prevent the destruction of the Abbey of Scone,[2] so dear to every patriot. He was also anxious to show that there was no desire for plunder. His statement with regard to the Perth outbreak, that the preachers warned their hearers beforehand against covetousness, that only the poor sought for spoil, and that no honest man was enriched by the value of a groat, is borne out by a letter of Kirkaldy of Grange, written on July 1 :

'The manner of their proceedings in reformation is this: they pull down all manner of friaries and some abbeys which receive not the reformation willingly. As to parish churches, they cleanse them of images and command that no masses be said in them ; in place thereof the Book set forth by godly King Edward is read in the same churches. They have never as yet meddled with a pennyworth of that which pertains to the Church.'[3]

The parish churches, it should be noted, were not destroyed ; nor were the abbeys and cathedrals, except at Scone and one or two other places, where the 'rascal multitude' got out of hand. In the case of Dunkeld Cathedral, for instance, minute instructions were given that no desk, window or door should be injured, that altars should be cast down and that 'images' should be carried to the burying-ground and burned there openly ;[4] and at Aberdeen, when a band of Mearns and Angus men 'under colour and pretence of godly reformation,' attempted to destroy the church fabrics, the provost called upon the citizens to resist the sacrilege, although the town had before

[1] It is often difficult to reach the facts. The destruction of the Edinburgh friaries with which Knox and Spottiswoode credit the 'multitude' is ascribed to the Congregation by Lesley and the *Diurnal of Occurrents*.—Spottiswoode, *History*, i. 280 : Lesley (Bann. Club ed.), p. 275. There is a similar difference as to the Stirling friaries.—Buchanan, *History*, xvi. 37 ; Moir Bryce, *Grey Friars*, i. 147.

[2] Knox, *Works*, i. 361-2.

[3] *Ibid.*, vi. 34. So Throckmorton reported to Cecil on July 9 : 'They deliver the parish churches of altars and receive the services of the Church of England according to King Edward's Book.'—*State Papers, Elizabeth* (1558-9), p. 367.

[4] Cardonnell, *Picturesque Antiquities of Scotland* (1788), i. 30.

then declared for the Reformation.[1] Undoubtedly the destruction of sacred emblems and other movable Church properties was great. It continued with intervals throughout the year with which this chapter deals.[2] Perth, Elcho, Cupar-Fife, Crail, Anstruther and St. Andrews were dealt with in May; Scone, Stirling, Linlithgow and Edinburgh in June; in July the Congregation set themselves to complete the desolation wrought by English invaders upon Kelso and the other Border abbeys; Glasgow was probably visited twice, in July and in February; Paisley, Kilwinning and Dunfermline Abbeys were cleansed and suppressed in September;[3] the attack upon Aberdeen was made in December; and, although the Congregation were absorbed in self-defence in the first months of 1560, they resumed their campaign as soon as their hands were free.[4] Yet the damage, which was overstated at the time by writers at a distance,[5] has been grossly exaggerated by modern assailants of the Reformers, who have not only ascribed to Knox demolitions and devastations of earlier and later generations, but have ignored the principle by which he was uniformly regulated. When called upon to define in writing the essentials of a reformation, he and his chief supporters claimed:

'That idolatry be removed from the presence of all persons of what estate and condition that ever they be within this realm . . . where idolatry is maintained or permitted, there shall God's wrath reign, not only upon the blind and obstinate idolater but also upon the negligent

[1] *Extracts from Council Register of Aberdeen*, 1398-1570, pp. 325-6.

[2] 'In this time all kirkmen's goods and gear were spoiled and reft from them in every place where the same could be apprehended.'—*Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 269.

[3] The 'suppression' of an abbey meant no more than its secularization. Dunfermline, Pitscottie says, was 'cast down' in March 1560; but according to Lord Bute, 'cast down' means that its internal decorations and furniture were destroyed.—*Essays on Home Subjects*, 1904, p. 260. Paisley Abbey, Knox says, was burned in 1561; but M'Gregor Chalmers holds that the abbey church was not destroyed by the Reformers.—*Trans. of Scot. Eccles. Society*, ii. 403.

[4] The order for 'cleansing' Dunkeld was issued on August 12, 1560. For details of the above, see Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, ch. xi.

[5] Thus Bishop Jewel wrote on August 1 that 'all the monasteries everywhere were levelled to the ground.'—Jewel's *Works* (Parker Society), iv. 1215. Lesley, in the version of his *History* prepared for Mary Stewart, describes Chatelherault and Argyll as 'trampling down places not before outraged.'—*History* (S.T.S.), ii. 428.

sufferers of the same, especially if God have armed their hands with power to suppress such abomination . . . and that churches be prepared for the quiet and commodious receiving of the people . . . as appertaineth to the majesty of the Word of God.'[1]

When at the beginning of July Knox was installed as minister of Edinburgh, the religious revolution, swift as it had been, appeared to be complete. Between twenty and thirty powerful nobles had signed the Covenant; the Covenanters had a force of 6000 in the city with other 6000 at command;[2] and observers believed that the movement was a national one. Thus Croft reported to Cecil that the nobles were wholly joined together;[3] D'Oyssel, who was in Scotland, wrote to France: 'In the evangelical faith all concur, high and low, *i.e.*, the better part (*la meilleure part*), so that it is necessary to play another game to divert them from their purpose.'[4] The Regent herself wrote: 'If the establishment of their religion is their only purpose, the greater part of the kingdom will concur with them';[5] Mary Stewart, then in Paris, lamented that her subjects were now alienated from the Catholic faith;[6] and Henry II informed the Pope that 'prelates, churchmen and almost all (*quasi tutti*) the greater lords and gentry were following the new sects and accepting their false and reprobate doctrine . . . the apostate preachers of the learning or doctrine of Geneva have induced the people to follow their damnable errors and heresies, whence the greater part of the people were corrupted and as it were lost.'[7] The spiritual lords had dispersed, 'through treachery or fear,'[8] and among the commons there was no resisting force. If a religious issue alone had been raised, it would have been settled in what may be called a provincial way, without influencing European affairs; but, in

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 188.
[2] *Ibid.*, vi. 35.
[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 109.
[4] Teulet, i. 318.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 325.
[6] Labanoff, i. 67.
[7] *Papal Negotiations*, p. 14; the Spanish ambassador reported in similar words.—Mumby, *Elizabeth and Mary Stuart*, p. 38. The Regent wrote on July 13 that, although the Congregation was small in itself, it was 'supported by the nobles, the towns, and the greater part of the population.'—*Papal Negotiations*, xxix.
[8] So Father Pollen, S.J., translates the words of the French ambassador, *par intelligence ou par crainte.—Ibid.*, xxix.

the language of the French ambassador, 'another game had to be played,' another question to be answered—whether or not Scotland was to regulate her own Church affairs. It was in the decision of that question that the Scottish Reformation gained international importance.

Rome made no contribution to the decision, although the religious future of her special daughter[1] was at stake and two popes had an opportunity of acting. The situation was laid before Paul IV fully and imploringly by the French King both by letter and by an embassy. But the Pope refused either to levy a subsidy upon the Scottish Church or to send a legate,[2] and would say no more than that he knew better about things than Henry, and that all heretics should be burned without delay.[3] When he died lamenting his own blunders,[4] a three months' papal interregnum followed. His successor, Pius IV, showed some vigour, agreeing to tax the clergy for the expense of fighting 'Lutherans' (*sic*) in Scotland, and granted full powers to a legate. Yet the assessment was delayed, and as late as May 15, 1560, he forbade any policy which would lead to expenditure, on the ground that Scotland was 'not yet declared schismatic.' A fortnight later he began to suspect that Scotland was going to perdition, but on the eve of the final abolition of his jurisdiction by the Scottish parliament he thought it enough to present Mary Stewart with a golden rose,[5] and on October 17, 1560, solemnly informed his cardinals that, although the Scots had extorted liberty of conscience, they were awaiting the decision of the Council of Trent. It is a memorable fact that in this crisis, which ended in the overthrow of papal authority, the Pope was an absolute cipher.[6]

[1] See vol. i. p. 228, 233, etc.

[2] The Bishop, who, as we shall see, visited Scotland in the autumn of 1559, was sent by France, not by the Pope.

[3] *Papal Negotiations*, pp. 23, 24.

[4] His last words were, 'How greatly flesh and blood have deceived me! From the time of Divine Peter there has not been a pontificate more luckless than mine; I am thoroughly ashamed of what has been done; pray for me.'—Manare, *Comment. de Rebus Soc. Jesu*, p. 125.

[5] In *Statuta* (I. clxv.) the date of the presentation is wrongly given as March 23, 1561; see *Papal Negotiations*, p. 49.

[6] 'At various times,' writes Father Pollen, 'Rome was ill-informed on Scottish matters, but never so wide of the mark.'—*Ibid.*, xxxvi, xxxvii, xlvi, 20-5, 29-31, 47, 48; Hume Brown, *Knox*, ii. 300-2.

None the less, there was an agreement among the Catholic Powers for the repression of Protestantism. It is open to debate whether an explicit treaty had been concluded after Cateau-Cambrésis, but undoubtedly there was a community of sentiment and practical unity of feeling, which played the part of a league and gave rise to rumours that a treaty had been arranged.[1] The agreement rested upon the idea, persistently disseminated by Rome, that Protestants were revolutionists who aimed at the overthrow of the constitutional authority of ruling dynasties. The Catholic Powers were so numerous and strong that they would have been irresistible if they had been united, but their religious agreement was checked by political jealousies, and with regard to Scotland these were specially keen. The desire of France to master Scotland, with a view to the invasion of England, was well known, and yet Spain, the most genuinely religious of the Powers, as the rival, if not the open enemy, of France, was strongly opposed to that step, preferring that Scotland should be independent[2] under a Catholic sovereign. The Emperor, although 'Catholic,' had his own difficulties with the Protestant princes of Germany and his own plans for alliance with England. So it was that France was the one Power which was set upon the maintenance of the Roman Church in Scotland, and the purposes of France were only secondarily religious. Although, after the outbreak at Perth, Francis had advised summary treatment of the Protestants, yet, when informed of their strength, he was willing to concede their demands. His ambassador, Béthencourt, was instructed to advise the Regent 'to dissemble with the Scots and to conform to their proceedings in religion,'[3] and another emissary, Sir James Melville, was told by the French Chamberlain that

[1] *Papal Negotiations*, xxxviii-xlii. Both Dean Kitchin in *Ency. Brit.* (9th ed. vol. ix. 559) and Wiriath (in 11th ed. vol. x. 828) say that there was a secret agreement between Spain and France against Protestant heresy, and Pollard (p. 222) says it was suspected that the French had relinquished designs in Italy, to concentrate their energies upon the British Isles.

[2] Teulet, i. 554; *Papal Negotiations*, 450-460.

[3] *State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, No. 1094; Forbes, *Transactions in Reign of Elizabeth*, i. 183.

Francis was 'willing to commit Scotsmen's souls unto God if they obeyed Mary Stewart with their bodies'; the king had enough to do in suppressing his own Protestants.[1] His watchword became a constitutional one, that the Reformers were rebels, and he could sound it out effectively in Scotland, in England and on the Continent, for the Lords of the Congregation had revolted against the Regent, who was the duly appointed representative of their Queen, Mary Stewart.

Successful resistance to France, even when thus single-handed, was beyond the powers and the hopes of the Scottish insurgents. They had nothing that could be called an army; the best fighting men were serving abroad as adventurers or mercenaries; the Highlanders, who were as yet untouched by the religious movement, followed their chiefs blindly, and Argyll was the only chief who had declared openly for the Reformation. The barons, burgesses and tradesmen who listened to the Reformed preachers, and the 'rascal multitude,' which wrecked abbeys and friaries, would be powerless against the well-drilled and well-equipped French regiments. The one hope lay in securing foreign assistance, and the only foreign Power to which they could turn was England. Ever since the accession of Elizabeth, leading statesmen both in England and in Scotland had recognized the need for an alliance, and had also seen that it must have a religious basis;[2] as the year 1559 advanced and Elizabeth definitely declared against Rome, the necessity became urgent, and when in May the Regent appealed to France for military assistance, a counter-appeal to England followed.[3] The one obstacle lay in the hesitations of Queen Elizabeth, who fully recognized the importance of the step she was urged to take, yet was extremely

[1] Melville, *Memoirs*, p. 52 ed. 1752.

[2] In January 1559 Percy responded to a proposal from Chatelherault for 'Christian amity between the realms' thus: 'Seeing God hath sent a true Christian religion among you, as now the same I doubt not shall take effect with us, how could it be better for the maintenance of God's Word than to join with us of England, and we with you, for mutual defence against France.'—*State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, i. 99.

[3] See letter of May 24 to Percy from Kirkaldy of Grange, who now appears as counsellor of Knox.—*Ibid.*, No. 763.

reluctant to take it. The religious sentiments of Elizabeth, if they existed, are impenetrable. In the words of a brilliant modern historian,[1] her religion was 'that of all sensible people; she was at one or nearly at one with the Huguenots, with the Popes and with the Lutherans'; but she thoroughly disliked Calvinism, not as a theology but because of its democratic tendencies. If, like her father, she was strongly anti-papal, she also resembled him in his absolutism; and, although she had refused to be termed Supreme Head of the Church, the title which she accepted in lieu of it, 'Supreme Governor as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal,' sufficed to convey powers over the Church which she intended to exercise; popular control of religious affairs was not at all to her mind.[2] Besides, she had a nervous desire to assert the sanctity of royal authority, and the thirty-four 'sects' of Reformers, which had by this time appeared in England,[3] as a sort of fringe of the Calvinistic system, included types of religion which, not without justice, she regarded as seditious and anarchical. It was in this mood that she wrote effusive letters to Mary Stewart even at a time when Mary's claim to the crown of England was all but made,[4] and told the Spanish ambassador that she wished to have the Augsburg Confession or something like it in England, and that she differed little from Rome, believing that God was in the sacrament and dissenting only from three or four things in the mass.[5] For Knox personally she had conceived an intense dislike, partly because of the freedom of his speech, partly on account of his treatise on the *Regiment of Women*. Her unwillingness to support the Scottish Reformers, which had these strong grounds, found a legitimate plea in the fact that England, France and Scotland were united by the treaty of Upsetlington,[6] the

[1] F. W. Maitland in *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 562.

[2] The sentiment was common in England. Archbishop Parker wrote on Nov. 6: 'God save us from such a visitation as Knox has attempted in Scotland, the people to be orderers of things.'—*Ibid.*, ii. 576.

[3] Pollard, *History*, p. 205.

[4] Labanoff, i. 65.

[5] Mumby, p. 9.

[6] The treaty was finally adopted on May 31.

'Scotland' of the treaty being the nation of which Mary Stewart was queen and Mary of Lorraine regent.

None of the Reformers saw more clearly than Knox that the help of England was required. Before his return to England, he had attempted to secure a private interview with Cecil;[1] and the success which had attended the first encounters with the Regent did not blind him to the situation. On May 28 he wrote to Cecil that 'perpetual concord between England and Scotland was the happiest prospect for both countries,'[2] and three days later he pled with Percy for English support in the event of the French army being augmented, pressing the fact that a French victory would be disastrous for England.[3] In his first sermon in St. Giles' he insisted that the Reformers were not rebels and that their aims were exclusively religious,[4] while in a manifesto which he penned for the Congregation he claimed no more than liberty for the preachers and the expulsion of the French.[5] Consistently, and indeed persistently, he placed the interests of religion first—at this time Knox was engaged in writing Book II. of his *History* expressly to prove that religion was the primary aim of the Reformers—so that the French ambassador, who had been assured that the Lords were political revolutionists, was seriously perplexed.[6] 'Concord between the two kingdoms' was, for Knox, only the means to an end, and the end would not be secured unless it were presented frankly from the outset; it was to be effected, he wrote to Cecil, 'by the preaching of Jesus Christ crucified,' for 'the time was come that Christ must reign and the hearts of the inhabitants be joined together.'[7] Kirkaldy was no less explicit in this matter; on July 1 he wrote to Percy: 'The Congregation have come forward seeking only for a reformation of religion, with goodwill to England as long as it maintains the Gospel';[8] but the dis-

[1] Knox himself attached importance to the letter written from Dieppe on April 22, already quoted. See page 93; *Works*, ii. 16 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, vi. 31.
[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 111, 117.
[4] Teulet, i. 325.
[5] Knox, *Works*, i. 366, 367, 370.
[6] Teulet, i. 310.
[7] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 112; Knox, *Works*, vi. 32.
[8] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 111.

tinction of Knox at this stage was that he overlooked features of the English Reformation of which he disapproved and concentrated attention upon the fact that England was now on the Protestant side. The Church settlement reached in the spring of 1559 was in many respects distasteful to extremists, who, like John à Lasco, regarded it as furnishing only a 'parliamentary' religion,[1] stained with the 'dregs of papistrie.' Knox himself, as we have seen, had come to disapprove of the Book of Common Prayer, from which the Black Rubric had now temporarily been removed, and the powers granted to bishops were in his judgment inconsistent with the 'purity' of religion; but being a Christian statesman whose eyes were fixed upon larger issues, he recognized that such differences must not obliterate the identity between the English and the Scottish Reformers, who were, in a phrase then current, 'of the same religion.' This view was fully shared by Cecil, who wrote to Scotland on July 4 that England would not allow 'those who maintained the truth of the Christian religion to be oppressed by any foreign Power';[2] but the Queen of England had as yet reached no such conviction, and until she was convinced, Scotland would be at the mercy of the French. The necessity was urgent. The Regent issued skilful proclamations from Dunbar, in the name of Francis and Mary, commanding the Congregation to leave Edinburgh, offering liberty of conscience to all loyal subjects, and claiming only that some restraint should be set upon the preachers and the mass celebrated at her court. Although the Congregation responded that, if the French troops were dismissed, the religious question might be decided by 'a general council lawfully convened or by the Estates,' and the Lords determined to 'remain in Edinburgh for establishing of the Church there,' the proclamations took effect. The forces of the Congregation began to dwindle. Some 'murmured,' saying that there was needless defiance of 'the authority,'

[1] *State Papers, Foreign* (1558-9), No. 1304. The words are, 'styled in derision "Parliamentary Theology."'

[2] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 112; Knox, *Works*, vi. 38-40.

some withdrew to their respective homes for harvest duty; and the death of Henry II on July 10, which left Francis and Mary Stewart King and Queen of France and made the Guises omnipotent, rendered the despatch of an irresistible French force practically certain.[1] On July 19 the Lords wrote urgently to Elizabeth, pressing for assistance against the devil, against idolatry, and against the 'maintainers of strangers who were making them enemies to their friends and subverting the common weal,' and reminding her that she 'had enterprised a like reformation in religion';[2] they also wrote to Cecil that they 'sought only to advance the glory of Christ, to preach the evangel, and to remove superstition,' and that if they received assistance they would never 'revolt to France.'[3] Knox, however, thinking such appeals inadequate, attempted a personal expedition to the north of England to stimulate 'the faithful' there,[4] for he steadfastly believed that success depended upon the support of religious conviction. Baulked in this scheme, he wrote privately to Cecil, and thereafter (July 20) penned a letter to Elizabeth,[5] such as she can scarcely have received from any other correspondent of any rank. It was intended as a conciliatory apology for his *Blast* against women, and he begins by saying that the time and circumstances of that publication make it clear that it was written without any reference to her, and that he heartily rejoices that, woman as she is, God has exalted her for the manifestation of His glory and the extirpation of idolatry. He holds her in love and reverence, and his past services to her in her adversity prove that she may rely upon him more than upon the men who are now crouching before her. He reminds her that her present high estate may make her forgetful that it is solely through

[1] The above is an abstract of the graphic narrative of Knox (*Works*, i. 363-371), who draws no veil over the half-heartedness of many adherents of the Congregation. At certain points his dates, etc., must be revised from documents given by Teulet and Labanoff, but the course of events is indisputable.

[2] The letter is in Knox's handwriting.—*Works*, vi. 43-4.

[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 113; cf. Froude, vi. 242; Knox, *Works*, vi. 40-3.

[4] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 112. The date of this proposal is not quite clear.—Knox, *Works*, ii. 26; vi. 46.

[5] *Ibid.*, vi. 47-51.

God's goodness that she enjoys 'what nature and law deny to all women,' and that in past years she declined from Christ in the day of His battle and bowed to idolatry. She is called to found her authority not upon laws, which from year to year do change, but upon the eternal Providence, which has exalted her beyond her deserts, and through her, a weak instrument, has granted rest to His afflicted flock in England. Should she begin to brag of her birth and to build her authority upon her own law, her felicity will be short. He concludes with the prayer that she may be so guided in her enterprises that God may be glorified, His Church edified, and she herself, as a lively member of the same, may be an example and mirror of virtue and of godly life to others.

While this 'apology' was on its way to its royal recipient, the Regent's forces marched from Dunbar to Leith, a town which was traditionally jealous of Edinburgh and which became the Regent's headquarters. The Lords were so weakened by withdrawals that on July 23-4 they were forced to accept an 'Appointment,' which included a provision that they should leave Edinburgh within twenty-four hours. The other provisions cannot be quoted with exactness, as no fewer than six contemporary versions have been preserved,[1] and all of these differ considerably; but they agree in recording that till January 10 Edinburgh was to be left free to choose its own religion, that neither Regent nor clergy should molest the preachers, who on their part should not attack the clergy or their properties, and that certain limits should be placed upon the occupation of Edinburgh by French soldiers.[2] In accordance with these terms, the

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 376, 379; *State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, i. 406, 407; Bain, *Calendar*, i. 231-4; Teulet, i. 328; Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 410; *A Historie*, in *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 65.

[2] The provision as to French soldiers, which is mentioned by Knox, Lesley and Teulet, is accepted by Hume Brown (*History*, ii. 62). Knox alleges that the terms which the Regent afterwards published were not those accepted by the Lords, of which he gives a version, and charges her secretaries with falsification of the document. Lang, who scrutinizes the Appointment closely (*History*, ii. 58-60; *Knox*, pp. 140-8), concludes that Knox 'knew that he was writing what was not true,' and 'deliberately said good-bye to truth and honour'; but the charge rests wholly upon a confused letter from Kirkaldy to Croft. Knox wrote

Congregation, accompanied reluctantly by Knox, withdrew to Stirling to take counsel; for, although liberty of conscience had been promised, they believed that the promise would be broken on the arrival of the French reinforcement, which was already on its way to Scotland. No sooner had they left than Edinburgh became a scene of confusion. The Regent's soldiers 'broke down the Reformers' preaching-stools at Leith and erected their idolatry';[1] at Holyrood, which she herself now occupied, the mass was celebrated daily; Edinburgh Castle was kept neutral by its cautious commandant, Lord Erskine, and on the slope between the Castle gate and Holyrood tumult prevailed. The Regent insisted that the citizens must decide by a vote to 'which religion' they adhered, while the preachers, headed by Willock, pled that that question had already been decided and that they were entitled by the 'Appointment' to continue their ministrations in St. Giles'. After altercation a meeting was summoned by the town-crier, but no citizens attended, and the preachers retained possession of the church.[2] The Regent then claimed that mass should be celebrated at the close of their sermons;[3] and, when the curious claim was rejected, her soldiers 'deambulated' during worship, the preachers denouncing them for their interruption of the service.[4] For a few weeks the preachers held their ground and 'the faithful increased daily,' but their sermons seem to have lacked the arresting pungency of Knox's preaching, for their hearers 'began to weary and took no great care of God's Word.'[5] The ebbing tide of popular favour was accelerated by persuasive proclamations[6] in which the Regent recalled all loyal Scots to obedience

this part of his *History* within two months of the events. It is certain that the two parties published different versions of the Appointment.

[1] Knox, *Works*, i. 392.

[2] *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 66.

[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 115.

[4] Knox, *Works*, i. 392.

[5] An anonymous document, to which modern writers from M'Crie to Lang ascribe great weight, as having probably been written by an eye-witness, describes a sermon preached in Holyrood chapel by Archbishop Hamilton at this stage, thus: 'After he had vomited a little of his superstition, he desired the auditors to hold him excused, declaring that he had not been well exercised in that profession' and that a learned friar would take his place.—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 67.

[6] Knox, *Works*, i. 397-9.

to the higher powers, and still more by the arrival of the French. First (Aug. 7) came Béthencourt, armed with diplomatic instructions;[1] ten days later a thousand soldiers arrived; and on September 24 two other ambassadors, Bishop Pellevé of Amiens and a diplomat, La Brosse, accompanied by more soldiers and a band of theologians, who had been enjoined 'to curse, to dispute with the Protestants, and to reconcile them if need be.'[2] Even before their arrival, Cardinal Trivulzio wrote to his eminent colleague Caraffa that, through the help of Chatelherault and the slaughter of some Lutherans, Scotland had been saved for the Church and the fear of impending disaster almost banished.[3] The mingled strains of the theologians' oratory 'enchanted' the Edinburgh citizens, and, Knox writes, they 'could no longer credit the truth plainly spoken.'[4] At the beginning of October the Regent, setting aside the 'Appointment,' to which neither she nor the Congregation had ever paid much heed, began to fortify Leith with a French garrison.

The confusion in the streets of Edinburgh and in St. Giles' was surpassed by the perplexity in which the Lords of the Congregation were involved, and Knox may be imagined as grimly smiling at the confirmation of his estimate of the regimen of women. When the Lords withdrew from Edinburgh, they took a covenant that none of them would have private dealings with the Regent, resumed negotiations with England, and separated, agreeing to meet again on September 10. Knox, upon whom the chief burden of the negotiations fell, was urgent and almost threatening in his appeals; he assured Cecil and Croft by letter, and at an interview with Croft at Berwick, that if the Lords received no assistance some would abandon Scotland and others would espouse the cause of France.[5] Those sagacious

[1] Teulet, i. 333, 559 ff.
[2] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 470, 474.
[3] *Papal Negotiations*, pp. 25-6.
[4] Knox, *Works*, i. 397. The accounts of Pellevé's policy vary; Buchanan (*History*, xvi. c. 6) says that he advised the slaughter of all hostile to Rome, but Lesley (S.T.S., ii. 420) represents him as mildly persuasive.
[5] Knox, *Works*, vi. 62, 68; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 115, 117.

statesmen required no persuasion, being convinced Protestants, and knowing the danger involved for England in the mastery of Scotland by France. They were anxious indeed that legality should be given to the proceedings of the Congregation by a decision of the Scottish parliament, but they went even further than Knox in recognizing the need for a change of 'the authority.' At Berwick, Croft agreed with him that the government of Scotland must be 'altered.'[1] Cecil advised him to follow the example of Henry VIII in laying hold of the property of churchmen,[2] and, on August 5, despatched the veteran Sir Ralph Sadleyr to represent England at Berwick, with instructions which show his desire to assist the Reformers without reserve. Sadleyr's aims are to be a conjunction of the nobility and commons with Chatelherault for the reformation of ruinous abuses, an agreement of the Estates that 'the land may be free from all idolatry like as England is,' and, generally, 'perfect peace with Scotland.' Cecil closes by indicating that it may be necessary for the Scots to depose Mary Stewart if she creates difficulties.[3] Yet on August 24 he instructed Sadleyr to 'devise such ways whereby they (the Scottish Protestants) may be helped by us and yet we to remain at peace as we do,'[4] and on September 8 he told Balnavis that, although their purposes are noble, they have the semblance of rebels, and therefore it is difficult for Elizabeth to help them.[5] Elizabeth was strongly opposed to identifying England with the cause of the Reformers, and, although she agreed that £3000 might be spent in 'making a perpetual concord' between the two nations, she imposed a condition that the money must be spent secretly; and when, on September 7, £2000 of it was handed over to Balnavis, he agreed to let it be thought that the money had been subscribed by the 'faithful.'[6] On the very day on

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 61; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 116.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 115; Knox, *Works*, vi. 53. Cecil says that 'good things should be put to good uses,' such as the enriching of the crown, the help of young noblemen, the support of the ministry, education and poor relief.
[3] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 375-7, 378 ff.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 403.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 430 ff.
[6] *Ibid.*, i. 392, 430-6.

which Elizabeth made this concession, she wrote to the Regent that she was indignant with the rebels, who were mightily deceived if they hoped for any favour from her in their foolish enterprises.[1] It is true that the French distrusted such avowals, and were convinced that she would play them false,[2] but the Scottish lords also distrusted her, and were disheartened by what Knox called the 'trifling' of the English.[3]

Other forces, however, besides diplomatic manœuvres were swaying the course of events. Scotland was in a ferment, and the prevailing tone and temper were not those of the Edinburgh citizens. On the very day of the retreat of the Congregation, Kirkaldy could write, 'By the forthsetting of religion and hatred of the Frenchmen we are getting the hearts of the whole commonalties';[4] and the scattering of the preachers led to the diffusion of their principles, for, with an indomitable leader, they had entry into most parish churches in the lowlands. Knox had summoned from Geneva his former colleague there, Christopher Goodman, a preacher after his own heart, who scorned everything that savoured of Rome,[5] and he was well supported by others; but he himself was the inspiring force. In the critical months, when Edinburgh was overawed by the French soldiers and 'enchanted' by French oratory, he was 'travelling constantly through the most part of Scotland,' so absorbed in evangelism that he seemed to grudge the time spent in his dealings with English statesmen.[6] 'We do but go about Jericho,' he

[1] Teulet, i. 334, 338.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 340, 353.
[3] Knox, *Works*, vi. 63; *State Papers*, *Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 115.
[4] Lang, *Knox*, p. 147.
[5] Knox wrote for Goodman on June 25; when he arrived in September, he found 'more thirst for God's Word than in England. Crosses, candles, papists' apparel, lordly bishops instead of necessary ministers, saints' days, wafer eating, etc., displease God and will bring a plague.'—*State Papers*, *Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 110; Pitscottie, ii. 161. Alexander Whitelaw, Knox's confidential messenger, should not be overlooked: he had received a pension under Edward VI, and was a very 'honest, sober and godly man, the most truly affectionate to England of any Scotsman.'—(Throckmorton) *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 468 n., 537 n.
[6] On August 3, he broke away from a critical interview with Croft at Berwick, saying that 'his flock required him.'—*Works*, vi. 62; *State Papers*, *Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 116; *Works*, vi. 61.

writes on September 2, 'blowing with trumpets, as God giveth strength, hoping victory by His power alone; Christ Jesus is preached *even in Edinburgh*, and His blessed sacraments are rightly ministered in all congregations where the ministry is established; and they be these, Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Dundee, Perth, Brechin, Montrose, Stirling, Ayr. And now Christ Jesus is begun to be preached upon the south borders, in Jedburgh and Kelso: so that the trumpet soundeth over all, blessed be our God!'[1] The exulting spirit of the commonalty and their strenuous purpose to curb the licence and avarice of churchmen are reflected in a ballad of the period, appended to the preceding chapter. The proceedings were methodical: signatures were taken to the various covenants; boards of 'elders' were appointed, in some cases by town councils, to exercise discipline over those who signed;[2] arrangements were considered for baptizing the children of 'papists' and for the maintenance of the destitute priests.[3] 'In spite of all opposition,' wrote Bishop Jewel, 'religion is being restored by the nobility with united hearts. . . . Knox, surrounded by a thousand followers, is holding assemblies throughout the whole kingdom.'[4]

Among the noblemen who at this time deserted the Regent, the Earls of Lennox and Huntly represented powerful highland interests, and Maitland of Lethington was far the most accomplished politician in the country; but there was still more importance in the accession of the Duke of Chatelherault, for his all but royal rank seemed to give the Congregation a plea for alleging that they were not rebelling against the ruling dynasty, and the project of a marriage between his thoroughly Protestant son, Arran, and the Queen of England was much in favour with Scottish Protestants and not unwelcome to some English

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 78.

[2] At St. Andrews, *e.g.*, the covenant of July was signed by 331 persons and a session was organized before October 27.—*Register of St. Andrews Kirk Session*, (S.H.S.), I. viii.

[3] Upon these points Knox consulted Calvin.—*Works*, vi. 94-8.

[4] *Zürich Letters*, i. p. 39.

statesmen.[1] Even before Chatelherault definitely came over, they publicly proclaimed that 'if the authority established by God is abused by wicked persons, it is legitimate to bridle their inordinate appetites, and that this appertaineth to the nobility, the barons and the people, whose votes and consents are to be required in all weighty matters of the commonweal.'[2] When, on September 10, they made their appointed rally at Stirling, the rumour of Chatelherault's accession was confirmed, and they moved at once to the ducal palace at Hamilton for consultation. Tidings reached them there that the Regent had begun to fortify Leith, and they resolved to strike. After addressing a vigorous remonstrance to the Regent, which so alarmed her that she proposed terms of accommodation and at the same time summoned fresh help from France, they again marshalled their forces at Stirling, and, marching thence to Edinburgh, entered the city unopposed on October 16,[3] the Regent and her adherents finding shelter in Leith. On October 19 Chatelherault, who had refused to meet with his brother, the Primate, and 'forbidden all men to pay him his rents,' publicly disclaimed designs upon the crown,[4] and on the 21st a formal meeting was held in the Tolbooth. After Willock and Knox, who were first asked to give their opinion, had asserted that the power of magistrates is bounded and limited by God's Word, and that the Regent, having altered the old law and consuetude of the realm, must be converted to the common weal and submit to the nobility, she was suspended from the regency in the name of Francis and Mary. The government was entrusted to a Council composed of Argyll, Lord James, Glencairn, Ruth-

[1] On September 8 Balnavis told Sadleyr that the secret intention of the Lords was to transfer 'the authority' to the Duke, or, if he should refuse, to 'his son, who is as meet, or rather more meet, for the purpose.'—*Sadleyr Papers*, i. 433. A few weeks later the Regent herself said: 'The Congregation did at first rise for the matter of religion; but now they shoot at another mark, and the Duke and his son mean to usurp the crown of Scotland.'—*Ibid.*, i. 502.

[2] Knox, *Works*, i. 411.

[3] Knox (*Ibid.*, i. 417) gives October 16 as the date of entry; but according to *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 119, he and Goodman were preaching in Edinburgh on October 14.

[4] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 497; Knox, *Works*, i. 439.

ven, Boyd, Maxwell, Erskine of Dun, Wishart of Pitarrow, Balnavis, Kirkaldy, the Provost of Dundee, with Chatelherault and Arran as 'principals,' and, 'for matter of religion,' Knox, Goodman, Willock and the Bishop of Galloway (*i.e.*, Gordon, Archbishop of Athens).[1] On the 24th the Regent was informed of her suspension, and ordered to leave Edinburgh with the French ambassadors and soldiers.[2] She withdrew to Leith, taking with her very few Scots 'of any name,'[3] and the Congregation, with shrewd Lethington installed as their Secretary and 16,000 nominal adherents, appeared to have triumphed. Sadleyr and Croft reported joyously to Cecil that 'blood had been shed which could not soon be stanched, and that Elizabeth had more for her £2000 than her father had obtained with his £6000.'[4]

Yet the actual prospects were dark. A French fleet occupied the Forth; rumours were credited that the English promises of help would not be kept; a price was set on Knox's head, and, in his own words, the battle was bitter and his days were dolorous.[5] The need for money was urgent, supplies sent from Berwick having been intercepted, and poltroonery appeared, with that bigoted contentiousness which has so often imperilled Scottish Protestantism. Scaling-ladders for the siege of Leith were put together in St. Giles', and the denunciations of this sacrilege by some preachers divided the Protestant mob. 'Their courage was dejected . . . many fled away secretly,' and most of those who stayed were destitute of counsel and manhood. This disintegration continued, 'never two or three abiding firm in one opinion the space of twenty-four hours.'[6] Within a fortnight of the Regent's suspension, stones were cast at the Lords in the streets,[7] and in an engagement at Restalrig 'most of their forces, being of the commons, fled.' When she, seizing her opportunity, marched upon Edinburgh, the

[1] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 510. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 444-451. [3] *Ibid*, i. 543
[4] 'The hope of all concord is taken away, by reason that blood is drawn largely on every side.'—*Ibid.*, i. 512, 514.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 680-2.
[6] Knox, *Works*, i. 460. [7] Lang, *Knox*, p. 150.

'substantial' citizens with their families left the city, and on November 6 the Lords fled 'pell-mell' (*pesle-mesle*, the French wrote), first to Linlithgow and then to Stirling.[1] Thus Edinburgh was restored to the Church, and after the Primate had purged St. Giles' from Protestant defilement, 'blotting out the ten Commandments,' says Pitscottie, 'and casting dirt on the walls,' the French theologians resumed their 'enchantments.'[2] Although the English Privy Council, when they heard of the catastrophe, sent funds 'secretly into Scotland to comfort the Lords,' with promises of further help, Elizabeth assured the French that her desire was to suppress 'the rebels' and renewed her vows of peace and amity with France.[3]

There was one force in the field which the combatants had not rightly measured. It was not only Elizabeth who condemned Knox. Cecil 'liked not his audacity,' and as far as possible suppressed his writings, seeing that his name and Goodman's were 'most odiose' in England,[4] and Randolph warned him to be more considerate of 'the condition of England' in what he said.[5] It was no doubt partly through the influence of these statesmen that at this stage Lethington superseded him as Secretary of the Congregation, but his last action in the office, the most discreditable in his whole career, proved his unfitness for diplomacy. The need for help from England led him to propose that, if the English were afraid to offend France, soldiers might be sent on the pretext that they were mercenaries or rebels who came against the will of the English government. The proposal was rejected by Croft as inconsistent with the honour of England, and Knox, while justifying it by the plea that the Regent had already broken the treaty, acknowledged that he had been partly induced by others to write the letter. And he informed Croft, with a manifest sense of relief, that his secretariate was ended: 'I hope that God hath delivered me from the most part of these civil

[1] Teulet, i. 378; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 122.
[2] Pitscottie, ii. 163; Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 421-3; *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 73.
[3] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 121; Teulet, i. 369-371.
[4] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 532, 535. [5] *Ibid.*, i. 515.

affairs, for now are men of better judgment and greater experience occupied in these matters.'[1] It was when he was absolutely alone or untrammelled by colleagues in his leadership that his unique strength was shown. At Stirling he addressed the discomfited Lords in a sermon which completely altered the situation, vitalizing the Congregation with religious thought. Basing his sermon upon Psalm lxxx., he showed that temporary defeats had been a leading feature in God's discipline of His people, reminded his hearers of the progress their cause had made when they had little support, and of their blundering pride in the accession of half-hearted noblemen, urged the need for personal penitence, and concluded with a stirring assurance that, although God might 'take some of His dearest away in the coming troubles and their own mortal carcases might be sacrificed, the eternal truth of the Eternal God would prevail.'[2]

'This sermon ended, in the which he did vehemently exhort all men to amendment of life, to prayers and to the works of charity, the minds of men began wondrously to be erected.' They despatched Lethington to England, issued an appeal to all Christian princes for protection against the French, and agreed to divide their forces between Glasgow and St. Andrews. At the latter centre Knox was the guiding spirit, and his influence appeared in a revival of the Reformers throughout Fife[3] and in his occasional interventions in the negotiations with England, but his main

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 94. The facts of the episode are given in *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 533-4, 568; Knox, *Works*, vi. 90-2; for estimates of Knox's conduct, see M'Crie, *Life of Knox*, 179; Hume Brown, *Knox*, vi. 57-9; Lang, *Knox*, p. 159. F. W. Maitland charges him with 'worldly wisdom.'—*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 575.

[2] Knox, *Works*, i. 465-473. The abstract of the sermon recalls the argument of St. Chrysostom's famous Sermon on the Statues. Even Buchanan, who is very sparing in his commendation of Knox, recognizes the historical importance of the sermon: *History*, xvi. c. 49; cf. *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 72. How faithfully it reflected Knox's convictions appears in a private letter to Mrs. Locke: 'Since Arran, etc., came over we trusted too much in our own strength; among us also were such as sought more the purse than God's glory. . . . The hollow hearts of many are revealed. . . . What is a multitude without the present help of God?' He entreats Mrs. Locke to send him Calvin's Commentary on Isaiah and the revised edition of the *Institutes*.—*Works*, vi. 100.

[3] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 603.

service was that he had persuaded the Congregation 'rather to die than to leave their enterprise.'[1]

The negotiations were protracted to a hazardous length. English statesmen saw clearly now that Scotland was in immediate danger of becoming subject to France. Even before the flight of the Lords from Edinburgh, Cecil promised that England would bear the costs of their army and check any French fleet too strong for them to resist,[2] and on November 12 he implored them 'to stand fast for God's sake,'[3] transmitting privately the draft of an appeal which would commend their cause to England. They ought, he wrote, to insist upon the Regent's cruelty and her breaches of faith, upon the tyranny of the French and their avowed designs upon the English crown; they must also declare their loyalty to Mary Stewart and place themselves under the gracious protection of Elizabeth; meantime three or four captains would be sent to lead their forces, but under the guise of private adventurers; the profession of loyalty to Mary Stewart, he adds, 'is thought essential *here* both for contentacion of the world and for the honour of Elizabeth'; the Lords must comply with this, 'whatever they may be compelled to do hereafter on that behalf.'[4] Elizabeth indeed was hard to manage, owing to her immeasurable duplicity; she agreed (on November 14) to send both men and money, but the concession was qualified by instructions that the forces should not go beyond Berwick, and she renewed her assurance to the Regent that she would not help the 'rebels.'[5] It was only when Lethington appeared,[6] bearing with him an almost verbatim reproduction of Cecil's draft, that on December 15 she agreed to send 4000 foot under the Duke of Norfolk and fourteen warships under Wynter; the fleet sailed almost at once, but the voyage to the Forth occupied a month. Week after week Norfolk's departure was delayed, and on January 11

[1] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 563-5. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 534-5. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 574.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 567-573. [5] *Ibid.*, i. 578, 581, 598.
[6] He was accompanied by Willock or by Balnavis, or by both.—*Ibid.*, i. 602, 629; Teulet, i. 383. According to Teulet, the delegates offered '*se donner*' to Elizabeth and proposed a union 'under the ancient name of Great Britain.'

Lethington had not yet received a 'final answer,' although he assured Cecil that the Congregation was being driven to despair.[1]

Lethington did not exaggerate, for the Regent, although burdened by a fatal illness, maintained her versatile activity with marked success. She proclaimed an amnesty to all Edinburgh citizens, and offered free pardon for past disloyalty to all burgesses throughout Scotland who would acknowledge her authority. To the offending Lords she made similar offers, confiscating the properties of those who refused them. She exercised every wile to persuade Lord Erskine to admit her to Edinburgh Castle, and rumours spread that she was on the verge of success.[2] She also disseminated reports, calculated to rouse patriotism, that Lethington was making a complete surrender to England.[3] Before the end of the year, when a French fleet was almost within sight, her forces marched from Leith to subdue the obdurate East Coast burghs. After ejecting the adherents of the Congregation from Stirling, they turned eastwards, ravaging the estates of all Protestants. The force was not large—probably not over 3000[4]—but they were trained soldiers, and their opponents were not only untrained but destitute of equipment and victuals. The pinch of poverty upon the Lords was at this stage severe; it is a curious comment upon those modern narratives which represent them as bloated with plunder, to read that for four months the households of the Earl of Glencairn and of Ormiston, Erskine of Dun and Kirkaldy had been in straits.[5] Those of the 'commons' who supported them slipped away in groups in search of fodder, and, although the gallant Kirkaldy did wonders, no solid resistance to the French was possible. When the Regent heard that her troops had routed the insurgents near Kinghorn, she exclaimed, 'Where

[1] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 125.
[2] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 585, 654; Knox, *Works*, ii. 3, 4.
[3] Teulet, i. 397.
[4] This was the estimate of Sadleyr and Croft.—*Sadleyr Papers*, i. 651; Knox gives the number as 4000, Lesley as 2000.
[5] *Ibid.*, i. 469, 530. 'Some that daily fed forty and more in household is not now able to feed two.'—*Ibid.*, i. 680.

is now John Knox his God? My God is now stronger than his, yea, even in Fife.'[1] The situation, indeed, alarmed and depressed Knox. He had, he wrote to Mrs. Locke on December 31, 'supposed himself to be practised in cares and temptations,' but he was now 'more pierced in heart than by all the torment of his sixteen months in the galleys; that torment did touch the body, but this pierces the soul and inward affections.'[2] Yet when he heard of the Kinghorn affair he joined the Lords at Cupar, and 'preached unto them a most comfortable sermon' upon the storm-tossed disciples of Jesus, exhorting them 'still to row against these contrarious blasts till that Jesus Christ should come, being assuredly persuaded that God would deliver them from the extreme trouble.' The French, however, were exultant. Ferreri reported to the Bishop of Ross 'that ejected monks had been restored, sacrifices were being offered upon re-erected altars and were better attended than ever, while many from the faction of the fanatics had returned to the Regent as suppliants.'[3] The Regent crowned her success by forging a letter which professed to be a humble submission of Chatelherault to her authority.[4] When his signature was being forged, sails, which for an hour were thought to be French, were descried on the Firth of Forth, and her soldiers fired a volley in triumph.

It was the last triumphant sound raised by supporters of the Church party. The ships proved to be the English fleet, and, while the Congregation withdrew to St. Andrews for a thanksgiving service, the French troops recognized that their expedition was at an end. An English force was landed on Inchkeith, and commissioners from the Lords met with English ambassadors at Berwick to draft a treaty between the two nations; for, by a transaction which was none the less important because it was informal, England now acknowledged that the Protestants, not the Regent, repre-

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 8. [2] *Ibid.*, vi. 104. [3] *Papal Negotiations*, p. 417, 418.
[4] *State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, ii. 480; *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 334; Teulet, i. 407, 566; Mumby, pp. 87-8. The proof of the forgery is irrefragable and is admitted by the most skilful apologist for the Regent.—Lang, *Knox*, pp. 280-1.

sented 'Scotland.' Knox was not one of the commissioners. About this time he 'extracted himself from all public assemblies, to his private study,' being, in his own language, 'judged among ourselves too extreme,'[1] a significant token of the approaching cleavage between religious and political interests. The agreement made at Berwick, which became a treaty on February 27, contained no reference to religion,[2] and consisted simply in an undertaking of the English to defend Scotland against France, the Scots on their part promising to assist England against French invaders, and declaring that they did not withdraw their allegiance from Francis and Mary Stewart.[3] Yet religion was the turning point in the contention; and in the six following months the inevitable consequences were worked out. France, England and Scotland were aware that, if French forces were removed, Scotland would be Protestant.[4]

France made every effort to prevent the ratification of the treaty. Hitherto she had declared the case to be one of political rebellion, but now she changed her *rôle* and avowed herself the champion of the Catholic faith. Within her own borders the Huguenots were rising;[5] and she appealed earnestly to Spain, representing the perils of the Roman Church in Great Britain.[6] Spain rendered valuable help in France,[7] but her unwillingness that the French should master Scotland prevented her from going beyond polite remonstrances with England.[8] Elizabeth on her part denied that she had ever spoken with the Scots about

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 105. Yet he occasionally gave counsel.—*Ibid.*, ii. 41; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 130.

[2] In the first draft, written by Cecil, a religious reason was given for helping Scotland, but this was deleted, probably by Elizabeth.—Russell, *Maitland of Lethington*, p. 46; Froude, vi. 327 n.

[3] Knox, *Works*, ii. 46-52.

[4] Knox recognizes the crucial and final character of the treaty, and introduces a long digression, 'that posterity may know how it had come to pass.'—*Ibid.*, ii. 15-65.

[5] The tumult of Amboise took place March 1560: the proof of any agreement between French and Scottish Protestants is quite inadequate.—*State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 126; Teulet, i. 484-7; Baird, *Huguenots*, i. 375; Mumby, p. 102.

[6] Francis wrote that nothing would induce him 'to grant his subjects religious liberty, to please a woman.'—Teulet, i. 471, 597, 603; *Papal Negotiations*, p. 45.

[7] Labanoff, i. 77; *Papal Negotiations*, p. 435.

[8] Teulet, i. 499, 511.

religion, assured the Regent of her peaceable intention, promised not to help the Congregation, and instructed her army not to attack the French nor to join the Congregation 'openly.'[1] It was only on March 24 that she issued a proclamation to Europe, intimating that she felt bound to check the designs of the Guises upon England by compelling the French to leave Scotland;[2] and, although Norfolk entered Edinburgh with his army on April 1,[3] he was instructed to agree with the Regent that the French need not be withdrawn as long as the 'rebellion' lasted, and to arrest the Scots who resisted her authority.[4]

The Congregation, although distressed by the delay and prevarication, had been strengthened by many accessions. After the thanksgiving service at St. Andrews, they had arrested the nobles who had supported the French and liberated them only under pledge that they would desist from opposition.[5] Many time-servers and trimmers—'byliers,' they were called—came over, some making public recantation. To those who hung back a public summons was addressed,[6] and the allies so secured included churchmen of influence and ability, such as John Greyson, provincial of the Black Friars of St. Andrews, and John Wynram, the reputed author of Hamilton's Catechism. Thus of six churchmen appointed by the Provincial Council to supervise the morals of the Archbishops,[7] three now joined the Congregation—a token of the fact that the life blood of Ecclesia Scoticana was passing into the new and only half-cut channel.[8] As the English army approached Edinburgh, the French withdrew, the Regent found refuge in the Castle, and the Congregation, now masters of the city, 'purged' St. Giles' anew[9]—the third but not the last of its transitions from creed to creed.

[1] Froude, vi. 261; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 134, 135; Lesley, (S.T.S.), ii. 431. [2] *Spanish Calendar*, vii. (quoted, Mumby, p. 98).
[3] *Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 82. According to *A Historie*, they were 8000 strong; Knox says 10,000 and gives the date as April 2.—*Works*, ii. 57, 58.
[4] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 719-720. Different instructions had been given him three days earlier.—*State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 342.
[5] *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 701.
[6] *Ibid.*, i. 713-14. [7] Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 163. [8] Grub, ii. 76.
[9] The 'others kirks' were 'purged' at the same time.—*Wodrow Miscellany*, i. 83; Pitscottie, ii. 169.

While operations of the English troops against Leith began at once, a conference was held (April 5-28) in Edinburgh, with the 'approval' of Elizabeth, between the Lords and the Regent's party which was represented by three French commissioners;[1] so clear was it now that her interests were not those of the Scottish nation. In the conference the French strove to detach the Lords from the English alliance by promising to concede liberty of conscience and to remove the French forces from Scotland, and Cecil secretly pressed the Lords to insist not only upon these points but upon the 'restoration of religion,' and advised them to sound Lord James as to his desire for the Scottish crown.[2] The French bishops reported to France that they found their opponents not unreasonable, but they proceeded to present an ultimatum which involved a complete surrender of the English alliance and unqualified submission to the Regent. The Lords at once rejected the proposal and the conference closed.[3] On the previous day (April 27), a new Covenant, more explicit and searching than any taken during the preceding two years, was signed by one hundred and fifty of the Reformers. It bound them 'to set forward the reformation of religion according to God's Word, to procure by all means possible that the truth of God's Word might have free passage within the realm, with due administration of the sacraments, and all things depending upon the same Word . . . to concur with the Queen of England's army for expulsion of the Frenchmen and recovery of ancient freedoms and liberties, to the end that in time coming they might, under the obedience of the King and Queen, be only ruled by the laws and customs of the country and born men of the land . . . and to reduce

[1] The Bishops of Valence and Amiens with La Brosse; Amiens had also a papal commission.—*State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 138, 147; Labanoff, i. 73; *Papal Negotiations*, pp. 35-9.

[2] In this matter Cecil seems to have misunderstood the situation. As late as June 19, he wrote to Elizabeth that Lord James was 'likely to be king soon' and expressed the hope that God would guide her to the choice of a husband. Of the numerous men and boys tendered to the Virgin Queen none would have been a more uncongenial mate.—*State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 154.

[3] For details of the conference, see *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 381, 571, 597; *Sadleyr Papers*, i. 730-2; Mumby, pp. 55-61; Froude, vi. 361.

to their duty whatsoever person should plainly resist this their godly enterprise.'[1] Two days later they took a step which had, as next chapter will show, still more permanent results, by instructing certain of their number to 'commit to writing and deliver in a book their judgments touching the reformation of religion, which heretofore in this realm, as in others, had been utterly corrupted.'[2]

The fighting round Leith continued, and on May 7 the French had a temporary victory; but 2000 English troops arrived, and France was too much occupied in dealing with her own Protestants to send reinforcements. The French cause in Scotland was unmistakably lost, and Francis and Mary despatched Montluc, bishop of Valence, and Rochefoucauld de Raudan, with full powers to make a treaty and a promise to ratify all their proceedings, 'even though something should fall out which might appear to require a more special instruction.'[3] Preliminaries had to be arranged, and before the commissioners reached Edinburgh on June 16, accompanied by Cecil and Dean Wotton as representatives of the English interest, the Queen Regent had died[4] of a dropsy by which her remarkable energies had been hampered since the beginning of the year. Her couch had been drawn to a window overlooking the Water of Leith, and she had watched the changing tides of battle with fierce exultation over every French success, but her dying hour was spent in a different spirit which invests the close of her exciting career with religious pathos. She summoned the Lords of the Congregation to her bedside, and bade them a friendly farewell, asking them to pardon her so far as she had given them offence. When they suggested her need for spiritual consolation, she agreed to see the preacher Willock, and to him 'did openly confess that there was no salvation but in and by the death of

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 61-4. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 183-4.

[3] Rymer, *Foedera*, xv. 581; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 293, 308; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 152; Labanoff, i. 74.

[4] June 9, 10 and 11 are all given by contemporary writers as the date of her death. Hay Fleming (*Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 216) quotes the sources, and concludes that she died 'on the 11th before 1 o'clock at midnight,' as recorded in *State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, iii. 125.

Christ.' Thereafter 'she embraced and with a smiling countenance kissed her nobles, one by one, and to those of inferior rank who stood by, she gave her hand to kiss as a token of her kindness and dying charity.' She is even said to have been silent when Willock spoke against the superstition of the mass.[1] Her career, so momentous for the Church in Scotland from the time when she ousted Arran from the regency, had indeed been stained by a duplicity which now and then sank below the low level of the statecraft of the times; but she had been disinterested and consistent in maintaining the interests of her fatherland, her kinsmen and her daughter. She had persecuted the Protestants only when constrained to do so by her political schemes; and the impartial student, turning aside from the damnatory verdict of Knox upon her character, will recognize that her policy was rarely regulated by religious considerations, and will see some justice in the saying of the usually unjust Bishop of Ross, that she was misled by her French advisers and was ruined by her endeavours to oppress a people which was 'mickle given to liberty and to be free.'[2]

The temper which prevailed in Edinburgh when the ambassadors arrived goes far to explain the settlement of religious affairs which ensued, and is illustrated by documentary evidence. On the day of the Regent's death the Provost and Town Council of Edinburgh summoned all idolaters and harlots to appear before the ministers and elders and give 'testimony of their conversion from their respective abuses,' with threats of drastic punishment should the summons be neglected—exposure at the Market Cross for a first offence, branding on the cheek and expulsion from the town for a second, and death for a third.[3] The same mood and method are disclosed in a letter from Randolph, the resident English ambassador, who writes:

'It is almost miraculous how the Word of God takes place in this country; they are better willing to receive discipline than any country

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 70-1; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 279; Tytler, vi. 159-165; Grub, ii. 76.
[2] Lesley (S.T.S.), ii. 442.
[3] *Extracts from Burgh Records of Edinburgh* (1557-71), p. 65.

I ever was in. On Sunday last, both forenoon and afternoon, there were at the sermons that confessed their offences and repented their lives before the congregation; Mr. Secretary (Cecil) and Dr. Wotton were present Wednesday afternoon; three others did the like. We think to see next Sunday the Lady Stonehouse, by whom the Bishop of St. Andrews has had without shame five or six children, repent herself. God send us great mercy hereof to His honour! The affairs here are very troublesome, the nature of men diverse, the liberty great, justice slenderly executed in all places. God save us from more discords among ourselves after the French are gone!'[1]

More definite in its bearing was a document which the Lords presented to the ambassadors, under the title of a Declaration of Requests, as a statement of the terms which they held to be essential for a peaceable and orderly settlement. Besides claiming the expulsion of French troops, the demolition of fortresses, the exclusion of foreigners from public office and an Act of oblivion—'such as was sometimes established among the Athenians'—they requested royal sanction for the meeting of parliament on the 10th of July, and stipulated that parliament should be authorized, 'according to the consuetude of the realm, used in all ages, to repeat, confirm, alter, eik (enlarge), or of new establish such laws and ordinances as they shall find necessary for quietness of the realm, as well anent the civil policy as uniformity of religion, wherein there is such controversy already arisen that, unless order be speedily taken by advice of the Estates, and an uniform rule be devised, the unity of the lieges cannot long continue.'[2] Manifestly the idea of liberty of conscience, if not withdrawn, had shaped itself into a claim that the faith of the Reformers, which in their view was the only valid basis of religious freedom, should be declared by parliament to be the faith of the nation. The discussions between the ambassadors, which lasted almost three weeks, resulted, on July 6, in agreements known as the Treaty of Edinburgh, which secured for the Lords most of their requests.'[3] Between England and France it was agreed,

[1] *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 429, 430. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 432-3.

[3] As the treaty was never ratified, it seems needless to specify more than its leading provisions; it is analyzed, with criticism, by Hill Burton, *History*, iii. 373 ff., and Lang, *History*, ii. 67 ff.

that both English and French troops should be withdrawn from Scotland, except a small French force to garrison Dunbar and Inchkeith, that all warlike preparations should cease, and that Mary and Francis should desist from using the title and arms of England. With their subjects the Queen and King of Scotland could not, of course, make a treaty; but it was arranged that they should not make war without the consent of the Estates, that in their absence from Scotland public affairs should be entrusted to a Council of twelve—five to be selected by Mary out of twenty-four nominated to her by parliament, that no churchmen or strangers should hold high office, though all clerics and their property should be protected, and that parliament should, with consent of Francis and Mary, be convened for July 10, and its business commenced on August 1. As to matters of religion, it was agreed that owing to their importance they should be referred to their Majesties by deputies who should take the treaty to France for signature after the meeting of the Estates.[1] The statesmanship shown by England in making such terms is manifest, for it was within her power to have asserted some suzerainty over Scotland; the collapse of the French cause was complete,[2] and the Reformers, although the religious settlement was not what they had requested, had little doubt how it would be interpreted[3] by parliament, and no doubt at all about the final result. The embarkation of the French forces began on the 14th of July,[4] and on the 19th Knox, who had preached almost daily during the negotiations, conducted

[1] Lesley says that the treaty did not deal with religion because the commissioners of England desired the Congregation of Scotland to receive the discipline and ceremonies conform to the Order established in their parliament of England, while the Scots, claiming the Order and discipline of Geneva to be more pure, would not receive any other, and the commissioners for France would have neither.—Knox, *Works*, ii. 82 n. 3. Grub says that as it was too important a matter to be settled by the commissioners, deputies were to be chosen at the ensuing parliament who should repair to France in order to effect an arrangement with the sovereigns.—*History*, ii. 79.

[2] On July 9 the French ambassadors apologized profoundly to Catharine de' Medici, saying that they had had no room for choice; Francis himself was lavish in his lamentations.—Teulet, i. 605, 606.

[3] Hume Brown, *History*, ii. 70.

[4] Pitscottie, ii. 171; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 108.

a thanksgiving service in St. Giles', closing with a noble prayer of confession and gratitude, a sentence of which will show his almost prophetic anticipation of the new era dawning upon the relations between England and Scotland:

'Seeing that nothing is more odious in Thy presence, O Lord, than is ingratitude and violation of an oath and covenant made in Thy name, and seeing that Thou hast made our confederates of England the instruments by whom we are now set at this liberty, to whom we in Thy name have promised mutual faith again, let us never fall to that unkindness, O Lord, that either we declare ourselves unthankful unto them, or profaners of Thy holy name. Confound Thou the counsels of them that go about to break that most godly league contracted in Thy name, and retain Thou us so firmly together by the power of Thy Holy Spirit that Satan have never power to set us again at variance nor discord. Give us Thy grace to live in that Christian charity which Thy Son, our Lord Jesus, has so earnestly commanded to all the members of His Body; that other nations, provoked by our example, may set aside all ungodly war, contention, and strife, and study to live in tranquillity and peace, as it becomes the sheep of Thy pastures and the people that daily look for our final deliverance by the coming again of our Lord Jesus.'[1]

As had been arranged, the Estates opened their meeting formally on July 10, but adjourned the proceedings till August 1, and the Reformers occupied the interval in 'considering the matters that concerned the stability of religion.' A committee of 'commissioners of burghs with some of the nobility and barons,' which had been instructed at the thanksgiving service to see to the equal distribution of ministers 'as the maist pairt should think expedient,' nominated Knox to Edinburgh, Goodman to St. Andrews, and six other preachers to be ministers of Aberdeen, Perth, Jedburgh, Dundee, Dunfermline and Leith; they also nominated Willock to be superintendent[2] for Glasgow, and Spottiswoode, Wynram, Erskine of Dun and Carswell (formerly parson of Kilmartin) to hold the same office

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 86. It is noteworthy that the liturgy sanctioned by the General Assembly in 1561 included a similar prayer for unbroken amity with England.—*Liturgy of John Knox*, p. 125. F. W. Maitland rates the international service rendered by Knox fully as highly as it is rated above. Knox was 'Elizabeth's best friend'; he not only secured Scotland for the Reformation, but saved England from France.—*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 577, 580.

[2] The office of Superintendent will be explained below.

in Lothian, Fife, Angus and Mearns, and Argyll and the Isles, respectively; but the nominations were subject to the approval of the 'countries' in which the nominees were to labour.[1] Ecclesiastically these proceedings were quite vague; for, although separate congregations in most 'reformed' burghs had, as we have seen, elders, there was no general organization, and the 'Congregation' had, since Lethington became its secretary and Knox 'extracted himself' from its councils, grown gradually secular, and styled itself at this stage 'the great council of Scotland.'[2] But there was no vagueness in the next proceeding, the drafting of a supplication to parliament by 'the barons, gentlemen, burgesses and others, true subjects of this realm, professing the Lord Jesus Christ within the same.' The suppliants knew exactly what they wanted from parliament in order to secure 'freedom and liberty of conscience, with a godly reformation of abuses which had crept into the religion of God, and were maintained by such as took upon themselves the name of clergy.' This supplication was threefold: (1) that the pestiferous doctrinal errors of the Roman Church, such as transubstantiation, indulgences, purgatory, pilgrimages, prayer to the saints and justification by merit of works should be abolished by Act of Parliament, with punishment appointed for transgressions; (2) that remedy should be taken to rescue the holy sacraments from the degradation into which they had been dragged by the abominable licentiousness of the clergy, and to revive the discipline of the ancient Church now utterly extinguished; (3) that since the Man of Sin, who claims to be vicar of Christ and unerring head of the Kirk, has taken upon him the distribution and possession of the whole patrimony of the Kirk, so that true ministers are neglected, godly learning and the schools are unprovided, and the poor are defrauded of their portion, parliament should grant remedy. Finally, the suppliants offer to prove that in all the rabble of the clergy there is not one lawful minister, and that as a body they are unworthy to be suffered in any

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 87. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 183.

reformed commonwealth, and urge that, if the churchmen fail to clear themselves of the charges brought against them, they should be pronounced by parliament 'unworthy of honour, authority, charge, or cure within the Kirk of God, and so from henceforth never to joy vote in parliament.'[1] The odium in which churchmen were now involved is indisputable. Cecil reported to Elizabeth that they 'dared not come out of the Castle for hatred of the common people'; [2] and, indeed, the abbots and priors are described as waiting in Edinburgh till 'order be taken of them in parliament.'[3] The bishops were dealt with personally by the Protestant Lords, and were required to listen to Knox's daily sermons in St. Giles'. Randolph reports that Dunkeld refused to listen to 'a condemned old heretic,' but that Dunblane had come 'not to reason on religion but to do what Argyll would command him,' and that the Primate told Chatelherault that, although 'for conscience he was determined to end his life in that mind he was of at present, he was prepared, for his body's goods and living, to yield all into his (Chatelherault's) hands and to obey all he would command besides matters of conscience.'[4] So clear had it become that the power and even the disposition of the churchmen to resist the claims of the Reformers were gone.

The recognized importance of the meeting of the Estates was indicated by an unusually large attendance.[5] Twenty-five or twenty-six churchmen were present, twenty or twenty-two commissioners from burghs and thirteen earls; but, besides, there were more than a hundred of the minor barons who, as has been shown, largely favoured the Reformers. Although entitled to attend by an Act of 1429, some of them had allowed their title to lapse, and it was thought desirable to declare their right by a special enact-

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 89-92: Knox adds a warning that, if this last counsel is neglected, churchmen will prove to be 'thorns in the eyes and pricks in the sides' of the Estates; this probably is an insertion made after the event.

[2] Mumby, p. 128.

[3] *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 429.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 461.

[5] Lethington 'did not remember to have seen in his time a more frequent parliament.'—*Ibid.*, i. 459. According to three existing accounts, the number present was above 185.—*Ibid.*, i. 463; Teulet, i. 613; Keith, *Affairs*, i. 311 ff.

ment—a clear proof that a dormant public interest had been aroused.[1] The procedure necessarily departed from Scottish usage, which entitled kings to scrutinize all proposed legislation with powers of veto; and, although the Edinburgh agreement had provided that parliament should meet in the absence of Mary and Francis, the Chancellor, whose function it was to act as Chairman or President,[2] absented himself, his place being taken by Lethington. But a graver irregularity was intended. It had been agreed, however vaguely, that the religious question should be laid before the absent sovereigns, and yet it was the question which the Estates had resolved to settle. In the opening sermon preached in St. Giles', on August 8, Knox made this obligation so distinct that Lethington is said to have murmured to a neighbour, 'We maun now forget ourselves, and bear the barrow to build the houses of God.'[3] When the Estates met next day for business, they confirmed the Edinburgh agreement and appointed, according to Scottish custom, a business committee, known as the Lords of the Articles, placing upon it none of the recalcitrant churchmen.[4] Immediately thereafter, they were faced by the supplication of the reforming barons and gentlemen. After it had been read, and 'diverse judgments of diverse men' had been expressed, the barons and ministers[5] were summoned and ordered 'to draw (up), in plain and several heads, the sum of that doctrine, which they would maintain and would desire that present parliament to establish as wholesome, true, and only necessary to be believed and to be received within that realm.'[6] The task was entrusted to six ministers, Knox, Wynram, Willock, Spottiswoode, Douglas

[1] *State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, of Aug. 19; *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 160. Rait seems to overestimate the volume of this new element; see Lethington, quoted above; Rait, *The Scottish Parliament*, p. 24.

[2] The term 'Speaker' was not in use in Scotland.

[3] Knox, *Works*, ii. 89; Froude, vi. 407-8.

[4] Archbishop Hamilton writes that five churchmen were included, but Randolph says that there were none of the 'old bishops.'—Keith, *Affairs*, iii. 5; *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 458.

[5] In Knox's narrative the 'barons, gentlemen, burgesses and others' now appear as 'the barons and ministers,' the ministers, of course, being the guiding force. Cf. *Works*, ii. 87, with ii. 92.

[6] Knox, *Works*, ii. 92.

and Row, who within four days submitted a statement of 'the Faith professed and believed by the Protestants within the realm.'[1] This document, which became known as the First Scottish Confession, included, with a brief definition of evangelical doctrine, an unqualified repudiation of the leading dogmas of the Roman Church. It was approved by the Lords of the Articles,[2] and on August 17 presented to the Estates. Chapter after chapter was read aloud twice, the preachers standing by ready to defend its statements if challenged,[3] but no definite objections were raised. Archbishop Hamilton, according to his own account, offered resistance, and was supported by the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane, the Abbot of Kilwinning, and to some extent by two lay peers,[4] but at least one of those whom he names was not present, and his affirmation that he and others 'resisted' is not inconsistent with the statement sent by Randolph to Cecil:

'The Archbishop of St. Andrews in many words said this in effect: that it was a matter he had not been accustomed with; he had had no sufficient time to examine it and to confer with his friends; although as yet he will not utterly condemn it, he was loath to give his consent. To that effect also spoke the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane. Of the temporal lords the Earls of Cassillis and Caithness said No; the rest with common consent and as glad a will as ever I heard men speak allowed the same . . . many offered to shed their blood in its defence. The old Lord of Lyndsay, as grave and goodly a man as ever I saw, said, "I have lived many years and am the oldest in this company of my sort; now that it hath pleased God to let me see this day . . . I will

[1] The doctrine of the Confession will be presented in next chapter.

[2] Lethington, writing on August 15, speaks of the Confession as 'already passed,' *i.e.*, by the Lords of the Articles.—Knox, *Works*, vi. 115. Randolph, writing on September 7, says that 'before it was published or many words spoken of it,' it was submitted to 'certain of the Lords,' and that they remitted it to Lethington and Wynram, who 'mitigated the austerity of many words and sentences' and recommended the omission of the chapter on the Civil Magistrate.—*Ibid.*, vi. 120-1. It is difficult to see at what stage this revision took place; no other writer mentions it, and Randolph himself does not speak of it in earlier letters which describe the proceedings up to August 24. Further, Wynram was one of those who had prepared the Confession, and the advice that the Civil Magistrate chapter should be omitted was not taken. There are reasons for thinking that the publication may mean the authoritative publication after the close of parliament. On September 13 Lethington offered Cecil to change or at least to qualify anything in the Confession which Cecil 'misliked' or which might give offence.—*Calendar of Scottish Papers*, i. no. 903; Lang, *History*, ii. 76-7.

[3] Knox, *Works*, ii. 121.

[4] Keith, *Affairs*, iii. 4-7.

say with Simeon, *Nunc dimittis*" . . . the Lord Marshall said that although he was otherwise assured that it was true, yet might he be the bolder to pronounce it, for that he saw there present the pillars of the Pope's Church and not one of them that would speak against it.'[1]

There is no doubt that the other three bishops present and all the abbots and priors, except Kilwinning, acquiesced in the decision, and that a great impression was made by their acquiescence. After the Confession was passed, St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane withdrew and failed to appear when called upon to support a petition they had tendered for the protection of their properties. Parliament proceeded to appoint a commission for furtherance of the marriage between Queen Elizabeth and Arran,[2] and to despatch a deputy to France to secure the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh;[3] and, although they refrained from considering the Book which had been prepared by the reforming ministers in compliance with instructions given on April 29,[4] they completed the religious revolution on August 24 by passing three enactments. By the first, the authority and jurisdiction of the Pope within the realm of Scotland were abolished, and all bishops and other prelates were forbidden to do anything in his name; by the second, all Acts of Parliament contrary to God's Word and the Confession of Faith now ratified were declared to have no effect in time to come; and by the third, it was ordained that—in view of (1) the corruption of the sacraments by the Church of Rome, (2) the fact that some persevered, notwithstanding the reformation already made, in saying mass and baptizing in secret places according to the Roman ritual—no one should hereafter administer the sacraments except those who were authorized to do so, and that all persons

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 117-18. Lethington, writing to Cecil, coincides with Randolph: 'The Confession of Faith passed by common consent, no man gainsaying. St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane asked leave to withhold their judgment, for they were not sufficiently advised with "the Book" which they asked leave to consider'; they would agree to anything consistent with God's Word.—*State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 465.

[2] *State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 161; Hay Fleming, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 214.

[3] Teulet, i. 613.

[4] See page 134. There is no record of a division on this subject, which will be considered in next chapter; Randolph indeed writes that it was not presented to the Lords of the Articles.—Knox, *Works*, vi. 119.

were forbidden to say or hear mass under penalty of forfeiture of their goods and corporal punishment at the discretion of the magistrate for a first offence, banishment from the realm for a second, and death for a third.[1]

These penalties, cruel and even barbarous as they seem to the modern reader, were in the manner of the times. In Scotland similar penalties were prescribed in pre-Reformation years for offences which now would be punished by brief incarceration,[2] and in February 1559 the Regent had proclaimed the penalty of death against those who 'disturbed Church services, bosted (bullied) priests, or ate flesh in Lent';[3] while in England those who even spoke against what were called the Queen's doctrines forfeited their lives for a third offence.[4] This new enactment applied only to those who after being banished returned defiantly to celebrate the prohibited usage, and, as we shall see, it was never brought into operation. The selection of the mass for specially stringent proscription was also in accordance with prevailing ideas. Luther and Calvin had fully recognized that the mass was the pillar or rather the fulcrum of the papal system; that conception of it had gained ground in England both among Romanists and among Protestants,[5] and with Knox was a settled belief. The testimony of twentieth-century Eucharistic Congresses need scarcely be invoked to prove that the Reformers were not mistaken in holding that all distinctively papal doctrines and usages are essentially related to the claim of the priesthood to be agents in the miraculous transformation of consecrated bread and wine. The unique feature of the

[1] *Acts of Parl.*, ii. 526 ff.

[2] Thus the penalties prescribed in 1538 for 'doing injury to green trees' were —first offence, £10, second, £20, third, death; in 1551 parliament prescribed the penalty of death for shooting at a wild fowl.—Hume Brown, *Scotland in Time of Queen Mary*, pp. 10, 67; Hay Fleming, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 219.

[3] *Statuta*, i. clvii n. [4] Froude, vi. 209.

[5] Note especially Ridley's crusade against the mass in 1550; Rowland Taylor at Hadley called a man who celebrated mass 'a devil, defiling the church with abominable idolatries'; in 1548 Bishop Gardiner said to Cecil, 'The mass, as I understand it, is the foundation of religion.'—Gairdner, *Lollardy*, iv. 327, 335, 357, 368; Pollard, *Political History*, p. 53; Froude, iv. 385. 'In 1559 the core of Popery which Englishmen hated was no longer the papacy but the idolatrous mass.'—F. W. Maitland in *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 563.

Scottish revolution is that it was accomplished swiftly, peaceably, and with little bloodshed. A revolution undoubtedly it was, politically as well as religiously; the debates in which controversial writers have indulged as to the 'validity' of these Acts of Parliament are mere playing with terms; there was, in the phrase of the day, an alteration of government,[1] and when such an alteration takes place adherents of the government which is altered are well entitled to allege that the action taken has been unconstitutional, or, if they prefer the term, invalid; and in this case those who hold that the change made furthered the best interests of Scottish religion and life will recognize without any reserve that a step of the utmost consequence was taken in the assertion of the rights of the commons and in challenging successfully the authority of monarchs. Reformation could not have been accomplished without a revolution, and the movement was singularly free from internecine warfare, for the battles of 1559-1560—insignificant battles they were—were fought not between Scot and Scot, but between Scots and French invaders. The extent of religious warfare and even of persecution was less than accompanied the Reformation movement in France, Spain, Italy, Germany or the Netherlands, and in England there were more martyrs, Protestant and Romanist, in a single month of Henry VIII or Mary Tudor than in the thirty years over which the Scottish Reformation extended. In the year of 'uproar' altars and crucifixes were destroyed, but not human lives, and it closed in almost complete tranquillity. The explanation is to be found in the facts recorded in the preceding pages. Those of the bishops and clergy who adhered to Rome were with few exceptions heartless, cowardly or blind. On the day after the acceptance of the Protestant Confession by parliament the Archbishop of St. Andrews wrote to the Archbishop of

[1] For a year the phrase was incessantly used by the leading pens. As early as September 8, 1559, Balnavis had told Sadleyr that 'an alteration of the State and authority' was contemplated.—*Sadleyr Papers*, i. 430-6. On the eve of the meeting of parliament (August 3) Knox wrote, 'An alteration of the Government is to take place.'—*State Papers, Scotland* (1509-1603), i. 115.

Glasgow, who had left his see to act as a political negotiator in Paris, with no words of regret and no appreciation of the magnitude of the event, manifestly absorbed in the destinies of the episcopal rents and expressing the opinion that the Reformers ought to concede 'liberty of conscience.'[1] There was no parallel in Scotland to the bravery shown by the Marian bishops in England after their deposition by Elizabeth. But the main cause of the quietness lay deeper. The vital and progressive forces of the country had already identified themselves with Protestantism. Not that all or nearly all Scotsmen had accepted the Reformed faith; large districts of the country were still untouched, both the western highlands and islands and the northern highlands, which adhered feudally to noblemen who favoured the French faction; but in central, southern and eastern Scotland, Protestant ideas had been welcomed by free-holders, burgesses and the 'commons,' and the welcome had been embodied in local legislation wherever there was a body to legislate.[2] The function of the Estates had never since their origin in the thirteenth century been to originate measures; they had merely ratified for the ruling power, royal, baronial or ecclesiastical for the time being, decisions which that power had already reached, and registered the decisions for governmental purposes.[3] The parliament of 1560 came together with no intention of discussing a situation or considering a problem, but in order to record the fact that Scotland had become Protestant and to embody that fact in an enactment. The minds and the motives of those who voted for the Confession varied greatly; patriotic, political, economic and self-seeking

[1] The suggestive letter is printed in Keith, *Affairs*, iii. 7-10.

[2] In the letter above quoted, Archbishop Hamilton tells his colleague that 'the elders of towns have taken upon themselves ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and that only preachers enforced or adopted by towns at their own hand are allowed to preach or to minister the sacraments.' This was, it should be noted, before Protestantism was 'established.'—*Ibid.*, iii. 10. Even local guilds had taken action. Thus, on July 28, hammermen of St. Andrews re-cast their rules, deleting all references to their saint, his altars, chaplains, etc.—*Register of St. Andrews Kirk Session*, I. vii, viii.

[3] Rait, *The Scottish Parliament*, pp. 9, 19 *et passim*; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*.

influences were at work, and there were many 'by-liers' who simply yielded to the swelling tide, but they were united in a determination to abolish the papacy and to find a basis for national independence. It was because the revolution thus effected rested upon religious beliefs which were already established in the chief centres of national life that it was not only orderly but permanent.

CHAPTER XXVII

CREED AND POLITY: CONFESSION OF FAITH AND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE

1560

Knox's *History*—The *Confession of Faith*—Its doctrinal teaching—Conception of the Church—The sacraments—The civil magistrate—Authority of the Bible—Preparation and purpose of the *Book of Discipline*—Provision of religious agencies—The office of Superintendent—A democratic Church—Education—Discipline and its enforcement—Church finance—History and features of the book.

THE proceedings of parliament created a remarkable situation. The papal jurisdiction had been abolished, the most distinctive of Roman usages had been declared illegal, and parliament had accepted, for the nation, a new statement of Christian beliefs. But the officers and properties of the Church had not been touched: prelates still sat in parliament, and no recognition had been given either to the members of the Reformed religion or to the organizations of their adherents which had sprung up throughout the country. Although the nation had been declared Protestant, there was no 'established Church,' no council, court or constitution recognized as responsible to the nation and for the nation in religious affairs. It might seem as if this implied some uncertainty as to the lines of Church development but for three documents which fall now to be considered—the 'History of the progress of religion within Scotland,' the Confession of Faith and the Book of Discipline.

The first of these is mentioned with the other two by the English ambassador when reporting, on September 7, to Cecil upon the leading items of reformation. He speaks of it as 'The Storie,' and says that Cecil will

have 'the first sight thereof,' as soon as it is 'absolvit' (issued). A fortnight later he reports that he has 'talked at large about it with Mr. Knox,' who will continue it if it meets with Cecil's approval, but will require fuller materials than are available in Scotland.[1] Although 'The Storie' has its place in literature as Book II. of Knox's *History of the Reformation*,[2] it was no private venture, but an enterprise undertaken by Knox in 1559[3] by the instructions of the Lords of the Congregation in justification of their policy. The avowed purpose of the writer is to show that their primary aim had been the reformation of religion and morals, that they had no seditious or rebellious intention, and that they had been reluctantly forced to oppose and disown the established civil authority. He did not profess to write impartially, but his intense zeal for a sweeping reformation and his unqualified impeachment of the character and methods of the opponents of the Congregation do not abate the value of his record, which was written from week to week amidst the events which it chronicles and is substantiated in essentials by recently published State documents.[4] He is as severe upon the lax and half-hearted adherents of the Reformers as upon their enemies; and, while neither Roman Catholic nor latitudinarian will ever accept his verdicts, the letters and manifestoes which he reproduces place beyond dispute that the Reformation would have col-

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 121.

[2] The *History of the Reformation* was not published during Knox's lifetime. It was first given to a printer in 1586, when 1200 copies were printed. They were suppressed, lest they should excite odium against Mary Stewart. A mutilated edition was brought out by D. Buchanan in 1644; the earliest correct text was issued in 1732. David Laing's standard edition was published in 1846.

[3] Writing on October 23, 1559, Knox says that the events happening 'are now to be set forth in manner of history.'—*Works*, vi. 87. Hume Brown (*Knox*, ii. 94) takes this to mean that Knox had not begun to write at that date. The Book (II.), however, was completed in November.—*Works*, i. 473; Lang, *Knox*, p. 276. It is incredible that such a treatise was written in a few weeks; and it is probable that the writing was begun in July, when the need for a manifesto was obvious. Even if five months be allowed, the production is a proof of the author's extraordinary vigour: he was in those months incessantly engaged in preaching and diplomatic correspondence.

[4] There are errors in Knox's dates and some of his charges of duplicity and profligacy are doubtless exaggerated, but the documents which he includes are confirmed verbatim wherever they are preserved in State Papers.

lapsed but for religious fervour. Beyond this, the narrative shows the process by which the convictions and intentions of the Reformers took shape. The Confession of Faith and the Book of Discipline are in themselves interesting productions; but it is only through the narrative of Knox that their significance and their value can be measured.

The Confession of Faith,[1] although written hastily, was prepared by the six leading preachers,[2] several of whom were men of scholarship, and immediately after its adoption by parliament it was translated into Latin for circulation among the Reformers abroad.[3] In a preface to the first published edition an offer is made to correct any statement which cannot be proved to be in accordance with Scripture. It was not included in the Book of Common Order published in 1564-5, the place of honour being assigned to the Confession of the English congregation at Geneva, and before the end of the sixteenth century several credal statements, such as the Second Helvetic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism, were approved by the General Assembly; and it is doubtful if it ever was used as a doctrinal test.[4] Yet it was again sanctioned by parliament in 1567, and, when the Westminster Confession was adopted by the General Assembly in 1647, the step was justified by the statement that it was in harmony with the earlier Confession.[5] No doubt it owed its long life partly to the fact that the ablest Scottish churchmen were occupied with ecclesiastical affairs other than theology, partly to the fact that it secured

[1] The text is given in Dunlop, *Collection of Confessions of Faith*, ii. 13-98; Schaff, *History of Evangelical Protestant Creeds*, pp. 437-79; Knox, *Works*, ii. 93-120. The Latin version printed by Schaff was made in 1572, probably by Adamson, and is therefore unimportant.

[2] See page 141.

[3] Knox, *Works*, vi. 119.

[4] Although superintendents were required to 'maintain unity of doctrine,' (*St. Andrews Register*, i. 73), yet in the Order for Election of Superintendents, dated March 9, 1561, the Confession of Faith was certainly not used. The only doctrinal questions asked were as to (1) the Scripture being the only true and most absolute foundation of the universal Kirk, (2) Christ being the only Head and Mediator, (3) Christ being only true God in Whom all the saved were elected, (4) God's eternal counsel, electing, justifying and forgiving—*Works*, ii. 144 ff. So, in the Book of Discipline, superintendents are to give satisfaction to congregations by sermons on special points, not to accept a creed.—*Works*, ii. 144-150.

[5] *Acts of General Assembly of Church of Scotland*, 1638-1842, pp. 158-9.

parliamentary sanction for Protestant doctrine. It has not the completeness of the Geneva Confession, the lucidity of the Gallican (1559), nor the succinctness of the Thirty-nine Articles; yet it reflects the views that prevailed in Scotland on several crucial questions.

Of its twenty-five chapters, the first fifteen are occupied with a statement of the New Testament doctrine of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, Redemption and the Christian Life. Special stress is laid upon the twofold nature of Christ; and, although the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds are not named,[1] the teaching of those symbols upon this topic is implicitly accepted. There is a good deal of needless reduplication, due to the use of phrases culled from different sources,[2] but no divergence from any dogma entitled to the epithet of 'catholic.' The evangelical doctrine of atonement is stated with devoutness and freshness. Although justification by faith is not defined in a separate chapter, it is assumed throughout, and nowhere treated as a debatable dogma. More surprising is the treatment of predestination. Although believers are repeatedly styled 'the elect,' this is in the line of Johannine and Petrine rather than of Pauline usage; and the chapter 'On Election,' after affirming in a subordinate clause that God has elected His people 'of mere mercy,' passes into a disconnected statement about the election of Christ for the office of Redeemer and His incarnation, while the idea of reprobation is wholly absent. Of Knox's strenuous predestinarianism there is not a trace: indeed the whole soteriology of the Confession exhibits rather the moderation shown in Hamilton's Catechism.[3] The necessity for good

[1] Yet this must not be pressed: the Book of Discipline prescribes the repetition of the Belief as requisite for admission to communion.—Knox, *Works*, ii. 240. The Apostles' Creed was rehearsed at the induction of superintendents. The heresies condemned at Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon are repudiated in Knox's Liturgy.—*Ibid.*, vi. 361, ii. 154, iv. 155. The teaching of the three creeds is avowedly followed in the *Confessio Gallica*, the *Confessio Belgica*, and other Reformed symbols.

[2] The principal sources are indicated in Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*, ch. vi., and Lee, *History of the Church of Scotland*, i. 133.

[3] Wynram, the reputed author of 'Hamilton's Catechism,' was one of the writers of the Confession. See pages 141-2.

works is emphasized with almost fiery urgency and occasional beauty.

'These works be of two sorts: the one are done to the honour of God, the other to the profit of our neighbour; and both have the revealed will of God for their assurance. To have one God, to worship and honour Him, to call upon Him in all our troubles, to reverence His holy name, to hear His Word and believe the same, to communicate with His holy sacraments—are the works of the First Table. To honour father, mother, princes, rulers and superior powers, to love them, to support them, yea, to obey their charges (not repugning to the commandment of God), to save the lives of innocents, to repress tyranny, to defend the oppressed, to keep our bodies clean and holy, to live in sobriety and temperance, to deal justly with all men both in word and deed, and finally to "repress" all appetite of our neighbours' hurt—are the works of the Second Table. Good works we affirm to be these only that are done in faith.'

Such admonitions are accompanied by firm assertions of the worthlessness of external religiosity and clear the Confession of any taint of antinomianism, although their value is abated by more violent denunciations of all things papal than are to be found in any contemporary creed.

The tone of the Confession changes when it proceeds to deal with the questions which were crucial in Scotland. Here all is succinct and precise; and, although many of the definitions are taken from Calvin, they have a sequence of their own which has left an impress upon Scottish Christianity.

'The Church is a company and multitude of men who rightly worship and embrace God by true faith in Christ Jesus who is the only Head of the Church. It is Catholic because it includes the elect of all ages, realms, nations, and tongues—the communion of saints, who have one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Outside the Church there is neither life nor eternal felicity: it is blasphemy to say that men who live according to equity and justice will be saved, whatever religion they profess. Although "this Church" is invisible, known only to God, it can everywhere be distinguished from the pestilent synagogue, the kirk of malignants,[1] which Satan has decked with the name of Kirk, by assured marks or notes. These are—not antiquity, nor title usurped, nor lineal descent, nor place appointed, nor multitude of men approving an error[2]—but (1) the true preaching of the Word of God, (2) the right administration

[1] *Ecclesia malignantium.*—Vulg. Ps. xxvi. 5.

[2] Cf. St. Vincent's marks of catholicity—'*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*'

of the sacraments, (3) ecclesiastical discipline rightly administered as God's word prescribes for the repression of vice and the nourishment of virtue.[1] Where these marks are seen and continue for any time (be the number ever so few above two or three), there without doubt is the true Church—not the universal Church, but a particular Church. Such churches there were in Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus and elsewhere, called by Paul "churches of God"; and such churches we the inhabitants of the realm of Scotland, professors of Christ Jesus, confess us to have in our cities, towns, and places reformed.'

The historical interest of this definition lies in its exact correspondence to the actual situation. As yet no organism had arisen to unite local 'churches.' The Reformers, as we shall see, had their own ideas as to the organization of national religion; but these had not yet been published and were therefore not taken into account. Yet there was permanent value in the strictly scriptural uses of the term 'church' and in the avoidance of the confusion which arises when New Testament epithets are applied to ecclesiastical organizations of a kind which did not exist in New Testament times. The Scottish Reformers made no exclusive claim for their Church. The Confession recognizes indeed that 'godly men lawfully gathered in General Councils may confute heresies and give public testimony of their faith to posterity, but it vigorously denies the title of Councils to 'forge new Articles of belief' and affirms that 'some General Councils have manifestly erred in matters of great weight and importance.'[2]

As to the sacraments,[3] while the Reformed as distinct from the Lutheran doctrine is adopted, there is an earnestness in affirming their supernatural character and spiritual value, and in repudiating Zwinglian beliefs, which is lacking

[1] These three 'marks' had been specified not only by Calvin, but in the First Helvetic Confession and in Scotland in Wishart's day; they were adopted in the Belgic, not in the Gallican Confession. Luther specified only Word and Sacraments; so Art. xix. of the English Articles.

[2] The statement of the Thirty-nine Articles, although much more concise, is in essence the same. 'General Councils . . . may err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God.'—Art. xxi.

[3] As printed in the *Acts of Parliament*, the Confession affirms that baptism and the Lord's Supper are the 'two chief sacraments,'—an expression probably due to a hasty adaptation of John à Lasco's language about circumcision and the passover. See Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 117 n. Knox and his comrades showed no tolerance for any of the other five Roman sacraments.

in some of the Reformed Confessions. Those who affirm them to be 'nothing else but naked and bare signs' are violently condemned, and the rumour that that is the Scottish belief is repudiated as a slander. The purpose of sacraments is to make a visible difference between God's people and the world, to exercise the faith of His children, and to seal in their hearts the assurance of His promises and their union with Christ Jesus. Baptism 'engrafts us in Christ Jesus to be made partakers of His righteousness ['justice'] by which our sins are covered and remitted'; it should be administered to the infants of the faithful as well as to those that are of age and discretion. But that sacrament had not been in debate in Scotland,[1] and attention is concentrated upon the holy Supper. While the dogma of transubstantiation is condemned as 'pernicious,' it is affirmed 'that believers do at the Lord's table so eat His body and drink His blood that He remaineth in them and they in Him: they are so made flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones that, as the Eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus . . . life and immortality, so doth His flesh and blood eaten and drunken by us give us the same prerogatives.' No doubt His body 'stands in the far distance of place,' being glorified in heaven, yet true faith, by a 'mystical action' carries us above all things earthly and enables us to feed upon His body and blood.' This is Calvin's definition almost verbatim; yet the Confession proceeds to say that the elements, although not to be worshipped, are not to be despised, but to be used with all reverence after careful examination, and assurance is given that the fruit of the mystical action is never lost, even though at the time of communion communicants are 'unconscious of as much profit as they would.' This eagerness that there should be no depreciation of the religious value and supernatural operation of the sacrament has proved to be a permanent feature of Scottish Protestantism.

For the right ministration of the sacraments there are two

[1] The brief condemnation of Anabaptists, who had not appeared in Scotland, may be ascribed to a desire to come into line with the Continental Reformers.

requisites—the use of the elements appointed by Christ,[1] and 'lawful ministers' who have been appointed to the preaching of the Word, or into whose mouths God has put some exhortation, 'they being men lawfully chosen thereto by some kirk.'[2] If these rules are neglected, the sacraments become invalid;[3] and, since the ministers of the papistical kirk are no ministers of Christ, and have corrupted the sacraments shamefully, they have 'adulterated the whole action of the Lord.' Unless the minister understands and explains the meaning of the sacraments, their right use ceaseth.[4] We have already[5] seen the gravity of this doctrinal error, which would make sacraments dependent upon the orthodoxy of the ministrant: yet presbyterian Churches, while discarding the error, have adhered to the rule that sacraments should never be administered without an explanation of their meaning.[6] Even more significant is another provision made for the right use of the chief sacraments. It 'appertains only to those who, being of the household of faith, examine themselves both as to their faith and as to their duty towards their neighbours. To partake without faith or being at dissension with brethren is to eat unworthily. . . . Therefore it is that in our churches our ministers take public and particular examination of the knowledge and conversation of such as are to be admitted to the table.' The logic manifestly lacks a link. Communicants must examine themselves: *therefore* ministers must examine them publicly and particularly. Yet the missing link is unmistakable. Communicants cannot be trusted to examine their own faith and conduct; they require to be assisted and guided by 'our

[1] This provision is applied both to the denial of the cup to the laity and to the use of oil, salt, etc., by priests.

[2] The Confession refers with special 'horror' to the ministration of baptism by women.

[3] The modern term 'invalid' misrepresents this position; they thought rather of effect, and 'ineffectual' gives the meaning more accurately.

[4] The Confession comes very near the Roman doctrine that the 'intention' of sacrificing priests is essential to validity.

[5] See vol. i. 329 f.

[6] In most presbyterian Churches the rule takes the shape of an order that sacraments are to be administered only 'after sermon.'

ministers.' So emerged a rule which would have given ministers a power over their parishioners greater than that possessed by priests either in the Roman or in the Anglican Church, if ministers had been left to exercise the power without a board of control composed of seniors (elders). The function of the eldership, however, is not indicated in the Confession, which defined the religion of the nation, not the constitution of the Church.

This limit to the intention of the framers of the Confession is most apparent in the Article (ch. xxiv.) which deals with the function of the Civil Magistrate. The topic was one which had been closely examined not only at Geneva but in every other centre of Protestantism, and in almost every 'Reformed' Confession scrupulous care had been taken to assert the interests of law and order without ascribing to civil rulers authority over the Church.[1] But in this Confession there is no trace of such anxiety. The powers of 'emperors in their empires, kings in their realms, dukes and princes in their dominions, and other magistrates in free cities' are declared to be 'God's holy ordinance, ordained for manifestation of His own glory and for the singular profit and commodity of mankind.' They are to be 'loved, honoured, feared and held in most reverent estimation . . . to them chiefly and most principally the reformation and purgation of religion appertains; so that not only they are appointed for civil policy but also for maintenance of the true religion and for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever, as in David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah

[1] Calvin's contention for the rights of the Church has already been explained; see page 15. The *Confessio Gallica* entrusts the magistrate with the 'suppression of crimes against the First as well as the Second Table of the Law'; he is to be revered only 'if he leaves the sovereign empire of God intact.' The Belgic Confession, which comes nearest to the Scottish, affirms that he should 'remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, protecting the sacred ministry and countenancing the preaching of the Word.' The Thirty-nine Articles state that, while he should 'restrain the stubborn and evil-doers, to him belongs not the ministering either of God's Word or of the sacraments.'—Art. xxxvii. Mitchell (*The Scottish Reformation*, pp. 100-2) suggests, and Curtis (*History of Creeds and Confessions*, p. 256) affirms that Lethington and Wynram secured the omission from the Scottish Confession of a statement of the limits of the obedience due to magistrates. See page 142; we agree with Lang (*History*, ii. 76), that this is very unlikely; so David Laing.—Knox, *Works*, vi. 121 n.

and others, highly commended for their zeal in that cause, may be espied. And therefore' those who 'resist the Supreme Power doing that thing which appertains to his charge, do resist God's ordinance . . . whosoever deny unto them aid, counsel and comfort in the execution of their office deny their help, support and counsel to God.' To regard this appeal as the formal statement of an ecclesiastical theory or to deduce from it arguments about the relations between Church and State is almost comically unfair. It was a clear call to parliament to carry out the work of reformation with a promise of loyal support—a call which parliament obeyed a week later, and a promise which for many years the Reformers studiously kept.[1] As yet there was no Reformed Church in existence in Scotland, and the Reformers urged parliament to abolish the Roman Church as a preliminary to the erection of a new fabric, the relations of which to the State were conceived, as will be seen presently, in a wholly different spirit.

Although those items of the Confession have their own importance, they are, even when taken together, less distinctive than the exclusive and absolute authority ascribed to the Bible. Inspiration is not defined nor even specifically asserted, but it is everywhere assumed. 'The Books of the Old and New Testaments which of the ancients have been reputed canonical . . . sufficiently express all things necessary to be believed for the salvation of mankind.' To allege that the Scriptures derive their authority from the Church is 'blasphemous.' It is not even admitted, as in the Thirty-nine Articles, that the Church is 'a witness and keeper of Holy Writ.' The true Church

[1] This Article (xxiv.) illustrates the measure of truth contained in Edward Irving's often quoted laudation of the Confession in his edition of the *Confessions of the Church of Scotland* (1831), p. xciii, as 'the banner of the Church in all her wrestlings and conflicts.' In no other wrestling or conflict, from St. Columba to the Disruption, did the Church display such a banner, but in this conflict it was certainly displayed to serve an emergency. Those who are best aware of the defects of the Westminster Confession recognize the ineptness of the comparison which Irving draws between the two documents. The one was hurriedly drafted, to secure the complete overthrow of Romanism; the other embodied the results of protracted theological debate. 'The fellow-workers of Knox, although accomplished divines . . . produced little in theology.'—Walker, *Scottish Theologians*, p. 2.

'always heareth and obeyeth the voice of her own Spouse and Pastor, but taketh not upon her to be mistress over the same.' The interpretation of Scripture 'appertains neither to private nor to public persons, but to the Spirit of God.' When controversies arise, 'we ought not so much to look what men before us have said or done as unto that which the Holy Ghost uniformly speaks within the body of the Scriptures and unto that which Christ Jesus Himself commanded to be done': for the Bible is consistent with itself, the Spirit of God being a Spirit of unity, and some plain text will always remove the difficulty of obscure passages.[1] Apart from these statements, the belief that Scripture and Scripture alone supplies an unchanging standard appears in almost every chapter. There is not a word at variance with the offer made in the preface to amend statements which could not be vindicated by Biblical proof.[2] This feature alone would entitle the Confession to be regarded as distinctively Scottish, for it has not the same prominence in any contemporary symbol. The Reformation view of the Bible, that as a guide in faith and life it is 'supreme, complete and intelligible,'[3] will always be associated with the name of Luther, and no other name has even a vague claim to be ranked with his in this respect; but it is different when nation is compared with nation.[4] Although Scotland was late in recovering the Bible—later than Germany, England, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Bohemia—the recovery was more signal than in any of those lands, and it left a unique impress upon the national religion. There had been no doctrinal discussions such as had elsewhere created a seeming necessity

[1] Lang in his scrutiny of the Confession ignores the context of the words—'the principal points of our faith.'—*History*, ii. 77.

[2] See page 150. A similar offer was made by the first Protestants of 1529. See vol. i. 426 n. The Preface was not included when the Confession was adopted by Parliament in 1567; but this in no way indicates the mind of those who drafted the Confession.

[3] Cairns, *Fourth Centenary of Luther* (1883).

[4] The Church which bears Luther's name has conspicuously abandoned his view. 'What would be said among us (Lutherans), if a man of honour were to demand a revision of the Augsburg Confession?'—Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vii. 33.

for binding theological formulae, nor any evidence that the Bible, which sufficed to nullify papal pretensions, required a supplement for any purpose. Accordingly the Scottish Reformers were not 'credal' in their conceptions, and all their manifestoes were framed in the belief that 'human' standards were subordinate. The designation of all creeds and confessions as 'subordinate standards' does not occur in the Confession, but the idea underlying that phrase is repeated again and again. No doubt the definitions are inadequate. While denying the right of 'private' interpretation, they assert for individuals a claim to ignore all human authority in language which calmer reflection would have prevented. Yet the fact remains that the protagonists of the Reformation, when called to set down promptly their ruling beliefs, set down no doctrine which can with any accuracy be styled Calvinist or Lutheran, except regarding the sacraments, and claimed that Romanism should be abolished because it was unscriptural and that the Bible should be acknowledged as the only infallible standard of national life. They thus set a stamp upon Scottish Christianity which for three hundred and fifty years has marked it off from other developments of Protestantism.

The doctrine of the Confession did not differ in essentials from the accepted and sanctioned beliefs of the Church of England. The Thirty-nine Articles were at some points, specially as regards justification by faith and free-will, more lucid and explicit in their Calvinism,[1] while with regard to ordination by bishops, afterwards so grave a ground of difference, they affirmed only that those who minister in word and sacrament must be 'lawfully called by men who have public authority given them in the Congregation.' Among diplomatists the prevailing idea was that the alliance of the two nations must be maintained upon the basis of identity in religious opinion. When the

[1] As late as 1570 Elizabeth was excommunicated by Rome as 'a partaker in the atrocious mysteries of Calvinism.'—Pollard (*History*, p. 213) finds an approximation to presbyterian ideas of discipline in Cranmer's scheme for giving power to annual diocesan councils including laymen.

Confession was under consideration, Throckmorton wrote to Cecil that England and Scotland were 'of one religion';[1] and on the day after it was passed, Randolph reported that he had talked with 'all' the Reformers, and that even such men as Goodman were willing that there should be uniformity in religion, recognizing the advantages that would ensue.[2] Yet in the same letter Randolph acknowledges that his hopes of such uniformity are almost quenched by the 'severity' of the Scots, and mentions a document which was of infinitely greater consequence than the Confession,[3] as it set a distinctive mark upon the religion of Scotland—the Book of Discipline or Polity, known subsequently as the First Book of Discipline.[4]

We have seen[5] that on April 29 the 'Lords of the great Council' had given instructions for the preparation of a Book 'touching the reformation of religion' in the realm. The task was entrusted to Knox and the five ministers who co-operated with him in preparing the Confession of Faith. The charge seems to have been fulfilled at once, for a copy which Knox reproduces in his history is dated May 20.[6] In August it was being translated into Latin for transmission to the chief Reformers of Geneva and Zürich,[7] and, although it was not then presented formally to parliament,

[1] *State Papers, Scotland and Mary*, i. 458.

[2] Knox, *Works*, vi. 119.

[3] 'The most important document in Scottish history.'—Hume Brown, *Knox*, ii. 148.

[4] The text of the Book is printed in Knox, *Works*, ii. 183-257; Dunlop, *Confessions*, ii. 515-608. The version given by Spottiswoode (i. 331-371) here and there alters and omits passages to suit Spottiswoode's view of the Reformers. The alternative title 'Booke of Policie' may be taken from Calvin's dictum that 'the Church of God stands in need of a Polity (πολιτεία) of its own'; but the Book itself gives an unusual definition: 'Policy we call an exercise of the Church in such things as may bring the rude and ignorant to knowledge or else inflame the learned to greater fervency or to retain the Church in good order.'—Knox, *Works*, ii. 237.

[5] See page 134.

[6] Knox, *Works*, ii. 257. This date, however, is quite inconsistent with the account which Knox gives in *Works*, ii. 128, where he represents the undertaking as having been begun after parliament dissolved. Grub (ii. 91) reconciles the statements by supposing that 'a draft prepared before parliament met was now revised and completed,' and Hume Brown (*Knox*, ii. 125) thinks that 'it may have undergone considerable modification.' But there is neither proof nor likelihood that it was modified after it was translated. Knox's two statements cannot be reconciled, and the earlier date alone has documentary verification.

[7] Knox, *Works*, vi. 119.

it was in private circulation, and soon after parliament dissolved was considered at length by 'the nobility.'[1]

It was an original production, with no parallel in the religious literature of any other land. A free use was made of the writings and the ecclesiastical enactments of the continental Reformers, particularly of John à Lasco, Calvin and Hermann of Cologne,[2] but this was in matters of detail rather than in principle. No doubt the general aim of Calvin was the same, but his *Institutes* dealt with principles and the *Ordonnances* were the outcome of compromise, while regulations of the religion of a comparatively small town were manifestly inappropriate in a national scheme. The Book of Discipline was specifically a proposal for the reformation of the religion of the Scottish nation, and in no other country were Reformers in the sixteenth century called upon to draft such a scheme, or indeed in a position in which they could do so with any propriety. In France their limited numbers would have made it preposterous, and it was in direct antagonism to the national ideals both of England and of Germany. While the Book thus derives interest from the unique circumstances in which it was composed, it is illuminated by the transcendent ability of Knox, who, although he had able colleagues, is revealed as the author of the most important sections both by the method of thought and by the style.

The Book, which is shaped as an address or report to the Great Council of the nation, begins with a plea that in every church and assembly in the realm the Gospel may be truly and openly preached and everything at variance with the Gospel suppressed. The plea is sweeping and unsparing, no doctrine, usage or institution being excepted. Scripture

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 128. The 'nobility' probably means the Lords of the Articles. When the Book was brought before parliament in January, some, says Knox, pretended that they had not seen it before.—*Ibid.*, ii. 138.

[2] Occasionally sentences of Calvin's *Institutes* and *Ordonnances* are reproduced verbatim. A still larger use is made of the *Forma ac ratio tota ecclesiastici ministerii* of John à Lasco, a Pole, who was leader under Edward VI of the Protestant foreigners resident in London. At points there are traces of Hermann's *Book of the Reformation* (1543) and other *Kirchenbücher*. See Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*; Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 145 ff.; Hume Brown, *Knox*, ii. 127 f., 136.

being the sole and sufficient standard and guide in religion, everything not expressly warranted in Scripture should be prohibited by the civil magistrate, with penalties. This prohibition should go far beyond the 'idolatrous' mass and should cover all details—saints' days, for instance (including Christmas), abbeys, friaries, nunneries and cathedral kirks except such as are used for devotional and educational purposes, and all church furnishings and ornaments not required for right ministration of Word and sacraments. For these there must be no toleration, partly because they are unscriptural, partly because they tempt men to superstition and withdraw attention from evangelical truth.

The doctrine to be established is not set forth in detail, but the incidental references to doctrine are consistent with the terms of the Confession of Faith. With regard to the sacraments, the standard named is the Order of Geneva, 'now used in some of our kirks,' which contains a catechism, 'the most perfect that ever yet was used in the Church,' with the supplementary counsel that baptism should be administered publicly and the Lord's Supper celebrated four times a year,[1] none being 'admitted to that mystery who cannot repeat the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and the sum of the Law.' But fresh ground is broken with regard to the agencies by which religion is to be maintained, specially with regard to ministers and their ministry. The right of particular kirks (congregations) and of Church members to elect their own ministers is laid down as a matter of principle. Although they forfeit that right if they fail to make an election within forty days, their liberty even in that case is carefully guarded; ministers nominated by other authorities must be publicly presented, and before they are actually appointed 'every several church shall have their votes and suffrages, so that no man shall be violently intruded.' Yet this by no means implies that congregations are free to elect whom they please. The minister-elect

[1] Calvin favoured a weekly but prescribed a monthly celebration.—*Institutes*, Book IV. 17, 44. The Book of Discipline states that the appointment of an Easter celebration leads people to think that one celebration a year is sufficient.

must be examined publicly by men of soundest judgment in some principal town adjacent, and give proof of his gifts and knowledge by interpreting a prescribed passage; thereafter he must give a public account of the chief controversies with enemies of the Christian religion, and finally he must proceed to the congregation which has elected him and preach in their hearing divers public sermons with special declaration of his belief in the office of Christ Jesus, justification, and the sacraments.[1] Besides, his personal character must be closely scrutinized, public notice being given in the homes of his childhood and youth that those who know anything to his discredit must give information thereof. Should no objections be raised, he may be admitted to his charge with solemn admonition addressed to him and to his flock, but the solemnity ought not to include the imposition of hands, for, 'although the apostles used imposition, yet seeing the miracle is ceased the using of the ceremony is judged not necessary.'[2] For ministers so settled good provision is made. A minimum stipend is indicated, but it is to be augmented when ministers have families or special expenses in the discharge of their ministry. Yet they are not to be left to their own will. They must do their work steadily and without reproach, preaching on Sunday and on one week-day at least, catechizing children, superintending and examining schools, showing special care for the poor, and studiously avoiding respect of persons. Should a minister fail to edify the Church by neglecting wholesome doctrine, by moral carelessness or even by sloth, he must be admonished by his elders, and should he prove stubborn they may appeal to the ministers of two adjacent churches, who shall be entitled to suspend him from office until he repent. If a notable crime has been committed, or a pernicious doctrine which undermines the faith been obstinately maintained, the penalty is final deposition.

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 190.

[2] Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, Book iv. 3, 16. Note that Calvin ascribed this function to ministers alone, not to the college of elders, in which he is followed by the Book of Discipline.

The Book recognizes the impossibility of securing an adequate supply of candidates for so arduous an office, and in order to meet the difficulty proposes to institute an order of Readers, who shall read the Common Prayers and the Scriptures to congregations which cannot meanwhile be furnished with ministers, and a higher order of Exhorters, who may exercise and develop their preaching gifts, and if they give proof of fitness rise to the status of ministers. The ministerial status must be maintained at any cost, and churches left vacant rather than supplied with an unworthy or inefficient ministry, for a vacant congregation is conscious of its needs while a poor minister deadens the conscience of his people. 'Those that have but a vain shadow do commonly without further care content themselves with the same.' In the existing 'rarity of the ministers' the Estates are called not only to pray that God may 'thrust out faithful workmen into this His harvest,' but to compel men who have 'gifts and graces able to edify the Church of God' to bestow them where their Honours and the Kirk shall think expedient.[1]

The position and functions assigned to ministers must be estimated in light of those of seniors or elders, who in every congregation were to be elected by a free vote of the people as 'assistants to the minister in all public affairs.' The appearance of this office in Scotland has already been noted. Before the Book of Discipline was drafted, elders had been appointed in several burghs, and now the method to be followed in making appointments was defined, and their duties were reduced to rule. They were to be elected annually lest their power should become excessive, and as great care must be taken as in the case of ministers that the people should have votes.[2] Except in the ministration of Word and sacraments, they were associated with the minister

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 195.

[2] Complete freedom was given to particular kirks as to the method of election. Knox records that in Edinburgh the outgoing elders nominated double the number required, of whom twelve were elected by the communicants; but care was taken that no communicant, present or absent, should be 'spoiled of his liberty in election.'—*Ibid.*, ii. 152.

in every office, and, in the case of 'inferior' congregations, must present an annual report upon the minister's life, manners, study and diligence,[1] while they were to be united with him on a footing of equality in supervising members of their congregation. This, it need scarcely be said, was a completely new feature of Church life, or at least a feature which had disappeared since New Testament times,[2] and in two important respects it supplied indisputable gaps in the Roman system, by giving congregations a direct share through elected representatives in the management of Church affairs, and by providing for a far closer supervision of ministers than the visitation of bishops and archdeacons had furnished.

The contrast to the Roman system was even more marked in the duties assigned to the diaconate.[3] Deacons, like elders, were to be elected by congregations, and were to assist elders in maintaining discipline, being even allowed to read 'in the assembly' if they were competent. But their main function was to deal with finance, which was taken entirely out of the minister's hands. Rules almost ludicrously rigid were prescribed for controlling their intromissions with funds — checks and counter-checks without number disclosing the firm intention of the Reformers that there should be no repetition of the malversation to which Church properties had for centuries been subject, and also the belief that those properties belonged to the people and should be administered by their chosen representatives.

In the chief towns, where particular kirks had already been erected, ministers, elders and deacons were recognized as supplying an adequate agency; but the task which the

[1] Hill Burton strangely, for so fair a writer, misrepresents the Scottish eldership, as though elders had been originally what they no doubt were in the eighteenth century, and perhaps here and there in Hill Burton's own time, 'creatures of the clergy.'—*History*, iv. 323.

[2] See page 76.

[3] In the Reformed Churches there was a good deal of hesitation about the diaconate. Calvin proposed that there should be two orders of deacons, the one 'who administered alms, and the other, those who cared for the poor and sick.'—*Institutes*, iv. 3, 9. In Scotland they were entrusted with both functions, indeed with all matters of finance.

Reformers had to face was to a very large extent the diffusion of their faith in districts where it was meanwhile unrepresented, and they clearly recognized and explicitly avowed that ministers who were occupied with their own local charges could not cope with the religious needs of Scotland. They proposed accordingly that districts should be assigned to Superintendents, whose special function it should be to plant and organize congregations and to appoint ministers where there were none, so that 'their Honours' love and common care over all the inhabitants of the realm should evidently appear, and those who had never heard Christ Jesus truly preached might be led to search and seek further knowledge of God.' It was proposed that ten or twelve 'provinces' should be instituted, six of these coinciding with the dioceses of the Roman Church, and that the first superintendents should be appointed by parliament, subsequent appointments being entrusted to the ministers, elders and deacons of the chief towns of the provinces, acting with town councils. Such an office, which was in line with the ideas of Luther and Melanchthon, and had been erected in some districts of Germany,[1] was at variance with the judgment and practice of the continental Calvinists, many of whom had already adopted the theory that all ministers should be on a footing of exact equality;[2] and therefore the institution of it is vindicated in the Book of Discipline by the plea that it is 'expedient for this time,' and very careful regulations are laid down to prevent superintendents from gaining or even claiming powers possessed by Roman bishops. In life and doctrine they were subjected to the censure and correction of ministers and elders. They were required to preach at least 'thrice every week,'[3] and to be constantly occupied. No superintendent was allowed to reside at his headquarters for longer than three or four months, or, when making his

[1] In Lutheran Churches *Superattendenten* were appointed by the civil magistrates.—Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, vol. ii.

[2] In the *Confessio Gallica* and the *Confessio Belgica* this was specially explicit. See Schaff, *Creeds of Prot. Evang. Churches*, pp. 377, 422.

[3] Knox, *Works*, ii. 204.

provincial rounds, to remain in the same place more than twenty or thirty days. They were to have no share in the episcopal revenues, and, if the stipends assigned to them were larger than those of ordinary ministers, that was only because their duties involved more travelling. In truth the office was so restricted and curbed that it was far from being an attractive one. Knox himself declined the office, thinking, as he says, that his 'estate [as minister of Edinburgh] was honourable enough,'[1] and it should be noted that the ministers of the 'principal kirks,' such as Edinburgh, were not subject to superintendents. Yet, in provinces which were mainly rural, their functions resembled in several respects those of bishops. Their provinces were entitled dioceses; in proceedings against defaulting ministers some episcopal responsibilities were laid upon them; the elders of their 'principal kirks' were entrusted with powers which had some likeness at least to those possessed by cathedral Chapters. Such resemblances or parallels led episcopalian controversialists of later times to contend that Knox and his comrades were episcopalians at heart,[2] and made their presbyterian opponents eager to refute the charge; but these contentions will seem pointless to impartial readers of history. It has already[3] been shown that Knox, while condemning the episcopate of those times, raised no objection to the office of bishop as such, and the institution of an office which bore some resemblance to the episcopate and was studiously guarded against its abuses merely proves that, like Calvin, he had not yet raised polity to the rank of dogma,[4] and adhered to the judgment laid down in the Confession of Faith that no one polity or order 'can be appointed for all ages, times and places.'[5]

The Book of Discipline, indeed, must not be regarded as a treatise on Church order, still less as a presentation of the

[1] Knox, *Works*, vi. 122.
[2] Unbiased episcopalians judge very differently. Superintendents, writes Grub (ii. 99), 'bore only a faint, external resemblance to the hierarchy.'
[3] See page 62.
[4] F. W. Maitland, *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 593.
[5] Knox, *Works*, ii. 113.

presbyterian system. The gradation of Church courts—kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synods and general assembly, which have come to be considered as essentials of that system—is not even suggested.[1] There are two or three references to the 'Council' of the Church, 'the great Council,'[2] but these are only incidental, and no hint is given of the constitution of the Council. The scheme was not ecclesiastical but national, intended to establish and secure the Christianity of the nation, without recognition of the Church as a separate fabric which might compete or collide with the State. Of the six Church offices which it specified, three disappeared within twenty years, and a fourth proved to be of little consequence. Its real significance and its permanent importance lay in its concentration and definition of the ideas by which the Reformers were guided, and in the tone which it imparted to the religion and character of the nation. Its general conceptions of Church life are its distinctive features and they are threefold.

1. Without any distinction of rank, hierarchical, political or social, the Church is identified with the people. The regulation that every several person should have a voice in the appointment of ministers, elders, and deacons is only an illustration of a pervading principle. The Christian equality of individuals is to be recognized in all respects, not only by checking tyranny and 'lordship,' but by giving the lowliest Scot a legalized voice in regulating the national religion. The cause of the poor is presented to the Estates with pathetic yet dignified eloquence. Respect is due to our poor brethren the labourers and manurers of the ground, whose life has been made dolorous and bitter by those cruel beasts the papists, and who are now being ground down in a tyranny as cruel by the lords and lairds who are absorbing

[1] Yet provisions for Church meetings are made in the Geneva Book of Common Order which was specifically approved. Note Knox's argument as to that point when disputes arose as to the holding of Assemblies.—*Works*, ii. 295-6.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 191, 226. The sentence in vol. ii. 251, referring to the Assembly of the universal Kirk, printed by Laing in capitals, is an insertion of later date.

Church properties. Of 'stubborn and idle beggars' the Reformers are not patrons, but the widow and orphan, the aged and impotent, who cannot labour for their own maintenance, have just claims which the Church must not only herself recognize but urge boldly upon parliament; 'fearful and horrible it is that they are . . . universally contemned and despised.' And in the Church their equality in God's sight is a religious truth which ministers and elders must studiously regard, for a Church is no Church which shows respect for persons. This definite acknowledgment not merely in sentiment or by way of compassion, but by conferring equal rights upon men of every rank, must be regarded in view of the fact that in Scotland the commons had at that time no political representation. Except some twenty representatives of burghs, parliament was composed entirely of spiritual and temporal peers and of freeholders who sat not by election but in virtue of their holdings. Thus the Church, as the Reformers presented it, was the one department of social life which met with and embodied the desire for equal treatment which for a generation had been pervading the nation. It was in the Reformed Church that the classes which had been in feudal bondage first found a clear recognition of their emancipation, and the resultant benefits were inestimable, for, if the religion of the nation acquired a democratic cast, its democratic tendencies came under those religious influences which alone can save popular or progressive forces from the perils of anarchy.

2. Equally influential were the minute and exhaustive provisions made for religious instruction and general education. The Reformers were convinced that ignorance was the chief hindrance to their enterprise, and that systematic instruction in the truths of the Bible must be the foundation of all their work. Accordingly a large and leading section of the Book of Discipline is devoted to setting forth a carefully thought-out scheme of general education which they proposed to make compulsory. It is a more complete scheme than that of Melanchthon, to whom the universities

of central Europe owed an immeasurable debt, for it surveyed the needs of the whole land and prescribed a gradation and correlation of schools—primary and secondary or higher grade schools leading to universities, at which also a gradation of studies with a view to the several professions was fully specified. In words which have often been quoted with admiration by modern educationists, the right of parents to 'use their children at their own phantasy' is repudiated, and the claim of the children of the poor to be trained for the service of the commonweal and of the Church is asserted, while the rich are denied any title to let their sons 'spend their youth in vain idleness as heretofore they have done.' The Estates are called to their obligation in this matter in well-measured language:

'If God shall give your Wisdoms grace to set forward letters in the sort prescribed, ye shall leave wisdom and learning to your posterity, a treasure more to be esteemed than any earthly treasures ye are able to provide for them; which, without wisdom, are more able to be their ruin and confusion than help or comfort.'

The education so provided was not in any sense to be secular, but, on the contrary, impregnated with religion. Every church in the land must have a day-school, taught by minister or reader in districts where a separate teacher could not be maintained, and all schools must be examined quarterly by the ministers and elders, 'with the best learned in every town.' Like many other plans set forth in the Book, this scheme was not realized for several generations.[1] Even if there had not been special obstacles, it was far too extensive to be implemented immediately, and indeed avowedly it was designed with a view to maintaining religion 'in purity in the posterity following.' Yet it explains the tone and character which were actually imparted to the ministry. The idea that preaching should appeal

[1] It is a not infrequent mistake to credit Knox with the parish school system by which Scotland has so greatly profited. At the most he adumbrated a scheme for establishing a school at every religious centre, and impressed upon the conscience of the nation that education should be universal and compulsory. The units he had in view were ecclesiastical, not civil.

to sentiment and rouse emotion was subordinated to the rule that every sermon should convey instruction and seek to convince the intelligence. In choosing their subjects preachers must not 'divagate' from one part of the Bible to another, but expound it continuously so that their hearers might become acquainted with the whole of its contents; and in their pastoral visitation they must examine from house to house, testing the 'fruit and profit' of their teaching. In order to foster knowledge of Scripture, weekly meetings, under the title of Exercises, were appointed in every town which was an educational centre, for the discussion of Scripture doctrine. Such meetings, which were regulated by the rules laid down in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, had been initiated by Reformers elsewhere, and the 'prophesyings' by which they had been accompanied had given trouble to the civil rulers as centres of revolution, but the Book of Discipline gave them a distinctive character in Scotland. Curious, 'peregrine' and unprofitable questions were to be avoided; there was to be no invective except in confuting heresies; interpretation of the Bible was the specific purpose of the exercises, and every deviation from that purpose must be checked by a presiding 'moderator.' Further, the exercises were not, as in most other lands, voluntary gatherings of the specially earnest and studious. All ministers whose parishes were within six miles of an 'exercise' must attend, and laymen who were credited with gifts which might edify the Church must be invited, and, if through idleness or false modesty they declined, compelled to come, with the help of the civil magistrate; for no man could be allowed to live 'as best pleaseth him within the Church of God.' The Christian 'fellowship,' which in the eighteenth century was a potent factor in deepening the Wesleyan revival, was here presented as an interchange not of religious experience but of religious knowledge. While the dialectical temperament of the Scots was thus deliberately enlisted in the service of the Church and emotionalism was discouraged, the interests of education and religion were declared to be identical, with a bold declaration that

'knowledge,' as the Reformers understood the term, would inevitably promote a reformation of the Church.

3. The conception of discipline, which gives the Book its usual title, was derived directly from Calvin, whose administration at Geneva had won Knox's whole-hearted admiration. 'Discipline,' the Book says, 'stands in reproving and correcting of these faults which the civil sword doth either neglect or may not punish.' One of the marks of a true Church is the exercise of discipline,[1] and in this exercise the Church furthers the welfare of the commonwealth and is entitled to the support of the civil magistrate. Neither by Calvin nor in the Book of Discipline was a clear distinction drawn between crime and immorality. The 'more horrible' crimes, which the magistrate should punish with death, include blasphemy and adultery, while less flagrant offences, with which the Church must deal, include deceiving of the poor by use of false measures, oppression of the poor by exactions, drunkenness and 'all excess.' In the mixed populace of Geneva, with its refugee libertines, the need for discipline was glaring, but not more so than in Scotland, where, as former chapters have shown, social disorder and the 'wretchlessness of unclean living' had been largely condoned by the Church. The religion of all Calvinists was strenuously ethical and included a fixed purpose that only those whose conduct conformed to moral law should enjoy Church privileges. But the Book of Discipline went far beyond this irreproachable maxim of Puritanism. Scotland must be made a Reformed Christian country. All its inhabitants, high and low, must be persuaded or constrained to lead a Christian life; and, when the Church dealt with offences which the magistrate could not or would not punish, she must put forth her full strength. Offenders must be quietly but firmly rebuked by minister and elders; and, if they persisted, admonished in the Church, with excommunication in the background as an ultimate penalty. With an excommunicated person none but his wife and family might have 'any kind of conversation, be it in

[1] See pages 152-3.

eating or drinking, buying or selling, saluting or talking with him . . . that he . . . seeing himself abhorred by the faithful and godly may have occasion to repent and be so saved.' His children had no real claim to baptism; and, although they might by act of grace be presented by the mother or some special friend, the person presenting must 'abhor and damn the iniquity and obstinate contempt of the impenitent.'[1] At least a year before the abolition of papacy by parliament, such customs had been practised; and the apologist for them may urge that a voluntary religious society may make its own conditions with its members; but the plea becomes meaningless when a nation has identified itself with one Confession of Faith and prohibited worship inconsistent with its terms.

In the same spirit, if not with the same harshness, compulsion is to be applied in enforcement. Heads of households must instruct their children and their servants in 'the principles of the Christian religion,' the result of their instruction to be tested annually by minister and elders. If they allow children and servants 'to continue in wilful ignorance, the discipline of the Church must proceed against them unto excommunication, *and then must the matter be referred unto the Civil Magistrate.*' Family prayers must be read morning and evening and the psalms for public worship practised at home, not because the head of the household was specially devout, but because he was a Scot, and Scotland must be reformed. The idea of liberty of conscience as set forth by Luther had disappeared or been veiled beyond recognition. When a man became a communicant and lived consistently he had many rights and privileges: but he was not at liberty to refuse to be a Christian, still less to assert that the 'Pope's religion' was Christianity.

4. When we turn to the financial proposals of the Book, the confusion into which Church estates had fallen becomes at once apparent. Political historians agree that about half of the taxable land was nominally Church property. Yet

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 230.

only a limited proportion of it was in the hands of churchmen. Many endowments, as previous chapters have shown, had come into the hands of laymen either by appropriation or by negotiations conducted in defiance of Church law, and for about ten years—since churchmen had discerned that their tenure of property was uncertain—such transferences had been scandalously frequent. Although sometimes there had been a *bona fide* sale at market value, there had often been collusion in the fixing of prices, and in the case of friary lands[1] the transference had been made under a pledge that they would be restored to the friars when the perilous days were past. It will be seen that some of the actual possessors were mere plunderers devoid of any just title, while others were the legitimate heirs of ancestors who had paid a fair price and could be blamed only for the fact that in the purchase Church law had been ignored. Perhaps the best instances of this last situation are that Lord James Stewart was in 1560 drawing the revenues of the priory of St. Andrews, and that Lord Glencairn and the Earl Marischal were proprietors of 'great quantities' of parish glebes. These three were noblemen whose personal integrity and zeal for reform were above suspicion. Further, the lands and rents still in the possession of churchmen were in very few cases utilized for what is considered in modern times the principal function of a national Church, the maintenance of religious ordinances throughout the land. It is impossible to be more specific, but it may safely be said that there are not twenty parishes in Scotland of which it can be asserted what stipend was justly due, and was paid, to parish priests in the year of the abolition of the papacy.

The recollection of these facts will explain the practical problems which perplexed and distressed the Church for several generations, but for the present it is enough to note how the framers of the Book of Discipline regarded the question of ownership and what adjustment they presented as a reasonable one. They began by claiming that all

[1] See page 37.

Church imposts and second tithes[1] by which the poor were burdened should be abolished, and proceeded to acknowledge that all just owners of teinds should be dealt with fairly. Fairness, however, must be determined by the deacons of the Church, to whom the holders of teinds must present accounts. Manses and glebes should be handed over at once to the Reformed minister or, failing minister, to the reader in charge. Teinds and tacks (leases) were in no case the properties of churchmen,[2] the Church being the indisputable proprietor; and in disposing of them the Church was entitled to 'her liberty.' This did not, however, mean that Church revenues were to be used exclusively for Church purposes; there were two other purposes which had as legitimate a claim, the maintenance of schools and the relief of poverty. It was not proposed that there should be a division into equal thirds, but no priority of one claim above the other two was alleged. Two special proposals deserve to be recorded as indications of the outlook of the Reformers: the temporalities of bishops, deans and archdeacons, and all cathedral lands, should be assigned to the maintenance of the universities, and the rents of hospitals, chantries, chaplainries, friaries, nunneries and priests should be retained for the uses of the localities to which they had been 'doted.' It was also conceded that in cases where laymen had paid a fair price for Church lands they should receive compensation, but they must submit written proof of such payment to the deacons of the churches concerned, and there was no appeal from the deacons' decision except to the minister and session, although an annual statement must be transmitted to the Great Council of the Church,[3] in order that 'both the abundance and the indigence of every church might be evidently known and a reasonable equality maintained throughout the whole land.' It was also urged that 'merchants and rich craftsmen in free burghs who had nothing to do with the manuring of the land' (*i.e.*, paid no

[1] See vol. i. 218.
[2] This was a reproduction of Knox's judgment expressed at his first public appearance in 1547. The teinds pertain not to churchmen: see page 52.
[3] See page 168.

teinds) should contribute to the support of their own churches, and that barons and gentlefolk should pay for the education of their sons. Far more noteworthy than any of the particular proposals is the belief that, while the religious endowments might with advantage and justice be utilized in part for education and poor relief, the allocation of them should be devolved by parliament upon the Reformed Church. Although that Church had not been established or recognized in any formal way, it stood there declaring itself to be Ecclesia Scoticana.

The Book closes with a frank recognition that some of its proposals will appear strange to the nobility, and that they may be tempted to prefer the interests of their carnal friends to the welfare of the poor flock of Christ Jesus, and with a warning that if they follow their own corrupt judgments they will bring upon themselves sharp and sudden punishment and the glory and honour of the enterprise will be reserved unto others. The financial proposals involved very great sacrifice on their part, for most, if not all of them, were possessors of Church properties. They were not prepared for the sacrifice. Some were willing, Knox says, that it should be sanctioned by parliament; others, perceiving that their carnal liberty and worldly commodity were somewhat to be impaired thereby, grudged, in so much that the name of Book of Discipline became odious unto them, and in their mockage they termed everything that repugned to their corrupt affections 'devout imagination.'[1] The Book was submitted to the Lords of the Articles in September,[2] and laid before parliament in the following January. Twenty-six noblemen, including Chatelherault and his son, Argyll and Lord James, signed a document approving it and promising to support it, with the significant proviso that bishops and other churchmen who had joined the Reformers should be allowed to retain their benefices during their lifetime, if they furnished a maintenance to the Reformed ministers.[3] But their signatures had no value. Time after time it was brought before parliament, but in

[1] Knox, *Works*, ii. 128.
[2] See page 161 and n.
[3] Knox, *Works*, ii. 257, 258.

vain. Knox continued to ascribe this to the self-interest of the Lords; according to his bitter saying, 'The belly hath no ears.' He was keenly disappointed, and frequently deplored the worldliness on which it was shipwrecked.

No doubt he was correct in his explanation. Yet even if the bellies had had ears and parliament had been composed of men devoid of corrupt affections, the scheme of the Book would have proved impracticable, not through the worldliness but through the humanity of the nation. If it shows Knox at his best, it also shows him at his worst, reflecting his domineering severity as well as his statesmanlike and intensely religious patriotism. Even Calvin recognized this and wrote to him when the fortunes of the Book were uncertain, expressing the hope that strictness would be tempered by discretion.[1] Indeed one is tempted to ask, as in the case of Plato's Republic and More's Utopia, if the authors of the scheme really expected that it would be carried into effect. But the question would be unreasonable. They were thoroughly sincere in seeking to secure that in Scotland there should be no 'ungodly impunity of sin,' no toleration for anything that 'worketh abomination or maketh a lie.' Although rejected by parliament, it was accepted as a manual of the Church, and, with amendments which did not alter its substance, was held in high honour, for more than a century.[2] The honour paid to it was not merely formal, such as we may pay while smiling over some of its extravagances.[3] Generation after generation of Scottish Protestants regarded it as an adequate expression of their ideal, sometimes paying most heed to those of its injunctions which least admit of defence. Only after bitter

[1] On April 23, 1561.—Knox, *Works*, vi. 124.

[2] Calderwood, *History* (1680 ed.), pp. 25, 29. Even after the Revolution Settlement some men clung to it, but they were dissentients.

[3] A young man desiring to marry a girl to whom his parents object because of her poverty or lowly birth is enjoined not to commit himself till he has appealed to magistrate or minister, who shall admonish the parents 'not to resist the work of God,' and thereafter, if they are obdurate, sanction the engagement. Funeral sermons were prohibited, lest ministers should either (1) be 'for the most part occupied in preaching them' or (2) should 'preach only upon the decease of the rich and honourable, and keep silence when the poor and despised departed.'

experiences of strife and sorrow was it acknowledged that the Christian liberties, religious intelligence and self-denying moral purity which the Book of Discipline admirably portrays are not to be maintained by the methods which it prescribes. Yet that these qualities should be made primary was in itself a Christian triumph.

INDEX

Abercorn, seat of first bishop of Picts, i. 104.
Aberdeen, bishopric founded A.D. 1132, i. 165; cathedral enlarged, i. 268; St. Machar's Cathedral, 1366, i. 208 *n.* 2; statutes, i. 241; Bishop Elphinstone, i. 335-6; cathedral library, i. 367 *n.* 4; University founded, i. 378-9; burgesses build friary for Observants, wives supplying vestments, i. 389; fishermen would not fish on Sunday without Pope's permission, i. 389; Lutheranism found early in diocese, i. 416; preacher appointed to lecture in theology, ii. 24.
Aberdour, Columban settlement at, i. 60, 62.
Abernethy, settlement of Dialrads at, i. 23; Columban settlement at, i. 62; stone church built, i. 99 *n.* 5; round tower, i. 144; Culdees, i. 187.
Adamnan, missionary work of, i. 97-8; adopts Roman usages, i. 98, 109; *Life of Columba*, i. 48, 67-8, 86, 139; *Treatise on Holy Places*, i. 139; liberates women from war, i. 146.
Aeneas Sylvius, Pope Pius II, comes to Scotland, i. 341; at Basel, i. 341; speaks of distribution of coal to poor at church door, i. 388.
Agilbert, bishop of the West Saxons, i. 93-6.
Agricola, campaigns in Britain, i. 4-5.
Aidan, king of Dalriada, i. 61.
Aidan, St., mission in Northumbria, i. 77-80, 107; personal characteristics, i. 78-9, 92; death, i. 83, 90.
Ailred, account of St. Ninian, i. 11-12.
Alban (Pictland), fusion of races in, i. 111-12.
Alban, St., i. 7-8.
Albany, Duke of, Regent after Flodden, i. 402.
Alchfrith, king of Deira, i. 91-3.
Alcluid (Dumbarton), capital of Strathclyde, i. 19; Britons defeated by Picts and Northumbrians, i. 107, 113.
Alcuin, mentions erudite verses of Celtic Church, i. 140.
Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, i. 98.
Alesius or Alane, Canon Regular of St. Andrews, i. 422 *n.* and Note N, i. 463; influenced by Hamilton's martyrdom, i. 451; friend of Melanchthon, i. 452; envoy to England, i. 452; rector of Leipzig, i. 452; his writings, i. 464.
Alexander I, king of Scotland, i. 162; erects abbey of Scone, i. 162; nominates Turgot to St. Andrews, i. 162; declares Church independent of Canterbury, i. 181.
—— II, king of Scotland, refused coronation by papal legate, i. 233.
—— III, king of Scotland, crowned at Scone by Scottish bishops speaking Latin, French and Gaelic, i. 234; defies Pope Clement IV, i. 235; Gaelic bard recites royal pedigree, i. 236.
—— VI, Borgia, Pope, i. 378; hypocrisy, i. 390.
Alleluia Victory, i. 9.
Amchara (soul-friend), in Celtic Church, i. 57.
Andrew, St., origin of the cult in Scotland, i. 10-11, 99 *n.* 4, 113.
Anglesey, centre of British Druidism, i. 4.
Angus MacFergus, king of the Picts, i. 107.
Antipopes of Avignon, i. 301; Scotland generally acknowledged, i. 304 *n.*; sanction many irregularities, i. 307-8.

Antonine, Wall of, i. 5, 6, 11.
Apostles of Erin, Twelve, i. 46, 49.
Apostolic succession, ii. 35, 62 *n.* 3.
Appeals to Rome, numerous and important, i. 243; ways they were dealt with, i. 244; irregularities often sanctioned, i. 245; financial burdens, i. 245; even during interdicts, i. 266; personal appeals by bishops and abbots, i. 372; proposals to renounce the Roman authority, i. 408; remonstrance by James v, i. 441.
Applecross, Columban settlement at, i. 97, 110.
Ardoch, Roman camp at, i. 5.
Argyll, Earls of, favour Reformation, ii. 58; Knox visits, ii. 70.
Arles, Council of, British bishops at, i. 8, 88 *n.* 3.
Armagh, Book of, i. 33-4.
Arran, Earl of, becomes Duke of Chatelherault, ii. 23; negotiates with Percy, ii. 123; joins the Congregation, ii. 123; acts against the Primate and disclaims designs upon the Crown, ii. 124; Knox's adverse opinion, ii. 127 and *n.*
Arthur, King, wars with Saxons, i. 17, 18 *n.* 3.
Arthuret, battle of, i. 21.
Artisans rise into importance, ii. 6.
Asaph, St., i. 20, 21 *n.* 1.
Attacotti, tribe of Borderland, i. 6.
Auchendavy, inscriptions at, i. 5.
Augsburg Confession, ii. 80 and *n.*
Augustine, St., of Canterbury, mission to England, i. 74-5, 90.
Augustinians, i. 196; deterioration in time of James I, i. 362.

Badenoch, the Wolf of, destroyed Elgin Cathedral, i. 304.
Bagimont's Roll, basis of valuation for church dues, i. 237; Benemund tries to raise the tithe, i. 237.
Balmerino Abbey, scandals in connection with, i. 442.
Balnavis, Henry, of Halhill, statesman, early life, ii. 53; treatise on *Justification by Faith*, ii. 54 and *n.*; opinion as to the duty of princes to reform the Church, ii. 54 *n.*
Bamburgh, i. 17, 77.
Bangor, monastery of, i. 42, 43 *n.* 3, 97.
Baptism, St. Patrick's view of, i. 32, 34; in Celtic Church, i. 54-5.
Bar Hill, Roman remains, i. 5.
Barbour, John, archdeacon of Aberdeen, i. 296; his epic, *The Bruce*, i. 297; his character, i. 297; *Collection of Sacred Legends* formerly thought to be by Barbour, i. 297; its character Eastern, i. 298.
Basel, Council of, last attempt to reform papal system, i. 339.
Beaton, David, Cardinal (nephew of James Beaton), abbot of Arbroath, i. 406; in France as diplomatist, i. 432; made Cardinal and Archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 433; Guardian along with three nobles, i. 435 and *n.*; Chancellor, i. 436; arrested and imprisoned, i. 436; liberated and holds convention, i. 437; supreme in Church and state, i. 439; immorality, i. 440 and *n.*; letter to, from Hay on wickedness of priests, i. 447; carries on hot persecution, i. 456; list of heretics executed by, i. 464, Note O; unites nobles against England, i. 466; cruelty at Perth, i. 467 and *n.*; plots to kidnap or murder, i. 472; assassination by Leslie and others, i. 480; character, i. 482; persecuting zeal, i. 482; murderers take refuge in St. Andrews Castle ii. 18.
Beaton, James, bishop of Glasgow, i. 405; archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 405; scuffle with Douglas clan, i. 405; heads opposition to England, i. 406; adventures, i. 406; congratulated by Louvain and Major for suppression of heresy, i. 423.
Bede, quotations from, i. 11, 14, 37 *n.* 1, 51, 73, 77, 93, 107, 109; account of Celtic Church, i. 37 *n.* 1, 71, 84, 86.
Beggars' Summons, ii. 4-5.
Bells, mystic value of, i. 143.
Benedict, St., i. 65 *n.* 2.
—— xi, Pope, i. 256.
—— xii, Pope, sends nuncios to make peace, i. 279; character, i. 278; protests against a French invasion of England, i. 279.
—— xiii, antipope, adhered to by Aragon and Scotland, i. 301; corruption of the Curia in his

time, i. 302; argument of Harding that Scotland should adhere to him, i. 314; issues letter for foundation of St. Andrews University, i. 322.
Benedictines, i. 197; deterioration in time of James I, i. 362.
Bernham, David de, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 211, 216, 222; constitutions of, i. 241, 248; consecrated a hundred and forty parish churches, i. 216; allows appropriations for building abbeys, i. 222.
Bernicia, kingdom of, i. 17; conversion of, i. 84.
Bestiaries, divine, i. 144-5.
Bible as standard of Scottish Church, ii. 159.
Bible-reading by Picts and Scots in A.D. 731, i. 140; in James IV's reign, i. 385; Lollards lay stress on, i. 386; act of parliament 1543 to permit, i. 436; importance of, in Reformation, i. 461; wide circulation of New Testament, i. 471.
Bible translations by Tyndale, Coverdale, etc., i. 429.
Birinus, mission to West Saxons, i. 83.
Birrens, Roman camp at, i. 5.
Birsa (Birsay), church built by a Jarl of Caithness A.D. 1064, i. 117.
Bishops, office of, in Celtic Church, i. 54, 71-2, 78, 86.
—— in Columban Church, whether ordained or not? i. 129, 134, 135.
—— Diocesan, set up by David I, i. 164; none in Scotland for 14 years, i. 180; diocesan and cathedral ideas, i. 210-11; discipline over the clergy, i. 212; prestige through courts administering justice, i. 213; election, i. 213-14; often of illegitimate birth, i. 215; generally appointed by kings, i. 215; financial difficulties, i. 216; two Scottish, at 3rd Lateran Council, i. 229 and *n.*; often political and military leaders, i. 253; patriotic supporters of Wallace and Bruce, i. 253; claim right to administer intestate estates, i. 317; low character in fifteenth century, i. 367; taken up with state affairs, i. 367; requests for removal of bishops and clergy, ii. 139-40; their unpopularity, ii. 140.
Blacader, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, contest with St. Andrews, i. 351; in 1492 made archbishop, i. 352.
Black Death, i. 277, 292.
Boece, Hector, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, account of Columba and Kentigern, i. 26, 323 *n.*, 379 *n.*, 412.
Bohemia, legend of the evangelization of Scotland from, i. 112; the anti-papal movement in, i. 380; sends manifesto about doctrines founded on Scripture, i. 381; account of its heresy by Bower, i. 382 and *n.*
Boniface, mission to Germany, i. 107.
—— IV, Pope, Columbanus' censure of, i. 45.
—— V, Pope, relation to Edwin of Northumbria, i. 76.
—— VIII, Pope, i. 256; sides with Scotland against Edward I, i. 257; in 1302 took side of Edward, i. 257.
Border-line between England and Scotland—the Tweed, i. 154.
Borthwick, Sir John, root and branch reformer, i. 458; rejects Anglican books, i. 459; estates restored after Reformation, i. 459 and *n.*
Bower or Bowmaker, John, abbot of Inchcolm, describes Lollardy and the burning of J. Resby, i. 326-9.
Brechin, Columba visits, i. 60; round tower at, i. 144; bishopric founded in 1153, i. 166; Culdees at, i. 187; bishops, i. 207.
Brendan, St., i. 23, 43.
Bride, St., her cult in Scotland, i. 22-3; connection with Brigit, i. 22-3, 27-8; authenticity of her mission to Scotland, i. 27-8; legend of, i. 46 *n.* 1, 147-8; her revelation from the Virgin as to the Popes, i. 327-8.
Bridget, *see* Bride.
Brigantes, early British tribe, i. 4, 5 *n.* 2.
British Church, continental relations of, i. 7-10; relation to Arian controversies, i. 8; Pelagian heresy in, i. 8-9; pilgrimages, 8; during Teutonic invasions, i. 16-25; in East Britain, i. 17; in West Britain, i. 17-18, 74, 76; in Strath-

clyde, i. 18-25; lack of vitality in, i. 25, 40, 74; characteristics, i. 26; independence of Rome, i. 39, 90-1; organization of, i. 40 *n.* 1, 74; relation to Columba's mission, i. 62 *n.* 2; clings to Celtic usages, i. 103-4, 109.
Britons, a Celtic tribe, *see* Cymri.
Brittany, relation to British Church, i. 9.
Broichan, chief druid, i. 59.
Brude, king of Picts, i. 25, 51, 59-60, 62.
Brunanburgh, battle of, A.D. 937, i. 116.
Brunhilda, i. 44.
Buchanan, George, i. 412; his *Franciscanus*, i. 445 and *n.* 3; flees from Scotland, i. 446; escapes to Bordeaux, i. 456; his genius, ii. 9; before the Inquisition, ii. 9; translation of Psalms, ii. 10; returns a Protestant to Scotland, ii. 10; praised by Knox, ii. 11 *n.* 3; Moderator of Assembly, ii. 11; his *De Jure Regni*, ii. 11; *Historia Rerum Scoticarum*, ii. 11; J. Melvill's tribute, ii. 12.
Buildings, church, in Scotic Church, i. 41; in early Britain, i. 11, 13; on Iona, i. 52-3.
Burning Bush, the emblem of the Scottish Church, i. 37.

CAINNECH, Columba's fellow-missionary, i. 61 *n.* 1.
Caithness, a bishopric A.D. 1147, i. 166; bishops murdered, i. 205; Bishop Gilbert of Moray, i. 206; bishop heads murderous attack about 1500, i. 407 and *n.*
Calvin, John, *Institutes*, i. 427; Ecclesiastical Ordinances at Geneva, ii. 15; Knox's opinion of his work, ii. 74; on elders, ii. 75; advises Knox to go to Scotland, ii. 78.
Candida Casa, *see* Galloway.
Candlemas, festival of, connected with St. Bride, i. 27-8.
Canterbury, Augustine's mission at, i. 74.
Carausius, king of Britain, i. 6.
Cardinals' report on morals in Scottish monasteries, ii. 36 *n.*
Catalogue of the Saints of Hibernia, i. 37-9, 72.
Ceadd, or Chad, St., missionary of Columban Church, i. 82; re-ordained according to Roman usage, i. 105.
Cealchyth (Chelsea), Council of, condemns Celtic orders, i. 104.
Cecil, William, Lord Burghley, promises help against the French, ii. 128; forms treaty of Berwick between England and Scottish Lords, ii. 137 and *n.*
Cedd, missionary to East Saxons, i. 82, 83, 93; accepts Roman usages, i. 105.
Celibacy, in Scotic Church, i. 31.
Cellach, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 120.
Cells, use of, in Scotic Church, i. 52 *n.* 5.
Celtic Church, in Scotland—dedications, i. 13 *n.* 3, 87; founded by Columba, i. 25, 51-62, 67; fasting, i. 53; Sabbath observance, i. 53; hymns, use of, i. 53-4; organization of, i. 54, 70-2, 82, 86-7; office of abbot, i. 54, 71, 86; office of bishop, i. 54, 71, 77, 78, 82 *n.* 4, 83, 86; Lord's Supper, observance of, i. 54-5; ordination, i. 54, 70, 78; office of presbyters, i. 54; observance of baptism, i. 54-5, 87; sign of the cross, use of, i. 55; Scriptures, transcribing of, i. 55; Easter date, observance of, i. 55-6, 67, 79, 87-8, 93-6; tonsure, method of, i. 55-6, 89; penance, use of, i. 57; provost, office of, i. 58, 72; nunneries, i. 62 *n.* 3; special characteristics, i. 64-5, 70, 73, 82, 85, 90, 100; independence of, i. 70, 86; celibacy in, i. 71 *n.* 1; succession to Church office, i. 70-1; missions of, i. 71-3, 90; hermits, i. 72; evangelization of Northumbria by, i. 77-80; evangelization of Lothians by, i. 80-2; evangelization of S. Britain by, i. 82-4; 'double monasteries,' i. 80; character of missionaries, i. 85; monasticism, i. 86-7; consecration, i. 87; church buildings, i. 87; ritual of worship, i. 87; relation to Rome, i. 86-91; orthodoxy, i. 89-90; submits to Roman Obedience, i. 98-100; orders repudiated by Council of Cealchyth, i. 104, 112 *n.* 5; monumental art of, i. 144-5.
Celts, migration to Scotland, i. 2-3; affected by Teutonic invasions, i.

17-18; disunion of, i. 2-3; religion of, i. 3-4.
Ceolfrid, abbot of Jarrow, i. 99.
Chalmers, James, of Gaitgyrth, ii. 88.
Chalon-sur-Saône, Council of, i. 70 *n.* 1, 112.
Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, canons of, i. 132.
Church Councils, held in Scotland, 1177-1221, i. 236; Provincial set up, i. 238; a Conservator of the rights of the Scottish Church elected annually, i. 239-40; Statutes, i. 241; business, i. 241; very little effect, i. 242; few meetings during War of Independence, i. 270; unimportant meetings about 1350, i. 289-90; attempt to revive by W. Trail, i. 310; General Council in 1418, as to claims of Pope and antipope, i. 314; Perth meeting of 1420 without much effect, i. 316-17; King's right about reserved appointments upheld, i. 343; after 1470 no meetings for 60 years, i. 344; meeting in 1536 to raise tax for College of Justice, i. 441; summoned by Beaton, i. 470; at Linlithgow and Edinburgh, pass enactments for Church reform in 1549, ii. 25; at meeting in 1552 heresy said to be checked, ii. 29; Hamilton's statutes ratified and new enactments passed for reform, ii. 29-30; order a Catechism to be prepared, ii. 30; in March 1559, attempts at Reformation, ii. 45; summoned by Queen Regent, ii. 90.
Clement v, Pope, i. 256.
—— vii, Pope, 'most unfortunate of Popes,' i. 401; tries to stir up James v against Lutheranism, i. 416; refuses to annul marriage of Henry viii, i. 428.
Clergy, manners and morals about 1300, i. 246; relation to women, i. 247-8; lax discipline, i. 268; wealth of Church in fourteenth century, i. 290; lowering of standard, i. 292; examinations, i. 293; secularization of religion about 1400, i. 309; non-residence, i. 368; immorality and greed, i. 369; despised by the people, i. 370; owned nearly half the kingdom, i. 413.
Clonard, monastery at, i. 42, 45-6, 49.
Clonfert, monastery at, i. 23, 42.
Clonmacnoise, monastery at, i. 42.
Clontarf, battle of, Norwegian power reduced, i. 117.
Coelestius, Irish heretic, i. 29.
Coldingham, monastery of, i. 80, 104, 108; endowment of church, i. 169-70.
Collection of Church dues, papal assessments £3000 for needs of the Lord Pope, i. 236; emissaries hindered in collecting, i. 286; nuncio as chief collector, i. 287; unwillingness about 1500 to contribute to papal treasury, i. 374.
Colman, abbot of Lindisfarne, i. 82, 92-7, 101-2.
Columba—relation to Kentigern, i. 22, 26; distinctive features of his work, i. 45, 46, 51-2, 55-6; personal characteristics, i. 47, 54, 62-5, 85; training, i. 48-9; love of the Scriptures, i. 49-50, 56, 63, 65-6; ordination of, i. 49; missions in Ireland, i. 49-50; excommunication and exile, i. 49-50; conception of Christianity, i. 51-2, 90; settlement on Iona, i. 52-7; attitude to Rome, i. 55-6; missions in Western Scotland, i. 56-9; missionary methods, i. 56-7, 59-60; use of penance, i. 57; missions in Pictland, i. 59-62; overthrow of Druidism, i. 59-60; his authority in Ireland, i. 61; organizes Dalriada, i. 61; the founder of a Church and nation, i. 25, 62, 67; last days and death, i. 65-7; *Life of*, by Adamnan, i. 48, 50, 59, 67-8, 86; influence after his death, i. 69-70, 72, 77; relics carried to Ireland, i. 100, 110; relics carried to Dunkeld, i. 113; meaning of the name, i. 48 *n.* 2; brought Irish ritual, i. 137; caligraphy, i. 139, 142, 143; chivalry, i. 146; miracles, i. 147.
Columbanus, missions to Europe, i. 43-5, 55-6, 84.
Comgall, Irish missionary, i. 45.
Comgan, St., i. 97.
Common Prayer, Book of, ii. 63-4; use of, in Scotland, ii. 81 *n.* 2.
Communion, *see* Lord's Supper.
Confession of Faith, Scottish, drawn up by Knox and others and presented to Parliament, ii. 142;

doubtful if ever used as a doctrinal test, ii. 150; succeeded by Westminster Confession, ii. 150; contents, ii. 151-60; its sources, ii. 151 *n.*; on good works, ii. 152; on the Church, ii. 152; gives Calvin's doctrine on the Sacraments, ii. 154; the ministry, ii. 155; mention of eldership, ii. 156; civil magistrate, ii. 156-7; on the Scriptures, ii. 157-9.
Confessions of early Reformation, i. 425.
Congregation, *see* Lords of the Congregation.
Constance, Council, i. 303; condemns Hus, i. 303; sets aside three Popes and elects Martin V, i. 303; no Scots representatives, i. 313.
Constantin I, king of the Picts, i. 113.
—— III, king of Scots, takes oath to maintain Church, i. 120.
Constantius Chlorus, campaigns in Britain, i. 6.
Convention of prelates, to proceed against heresy, ii. 24.
Cooldrevny, battle of, i. 50.
Cormac, Saint, i. 59; 'a bishop without a see,' i. 168.
Coronation, first Scottish, at Iona, i. 61; later, i. 233 *n.* 5.
Coroticus, king of the Picts, i. 19.
Craw, or Crawar, Paul, i. 381; a delegate sent from Bohemia, i. 381; burned at St. Andrews, i. 381 and 382 *n.*
Crosiers, manufacture of, i. 143 and *n.*
Cross, Celtic, in carvings, i. 145.
Crystall, Thomas, abbot of Kinloss, services to education, i. 410.
Cuchulainn Cycle of legends, i. 149.
Culdees, Jocelyn's account of, i. 26; i. 125-33; Dunkeld and St. Andrews their religious capitals, i. 126; of Lochleven, i. 126; outside Scotland, i. 127; celibacy of, i. 128 and Note G, 133; metrical rule of the Keledei, i. 130, 150; Church rapidly disappeared, i. 185-90; a corporation at St. Andrews till the Reformation, i. 191.
Culross, St. Serf's mission at, i. 23.
Cumbria, use of the name, i. 18 *n.* 1.
Cummian, abbot of Iona, i. 57 *n.* 1, 67.
Cupar in Fife, i. 291, 448 *n.*; armistice between Regent and Lords at Cupar Muir, ii. 105, 109.
Cuthbert, St., missions, i. 81-2; life and ministry after Council of Whitby, i. 105-6, 117, 169, 247 *n.*
Cymri, Celtic tribe, i. 2.
Cynewulf, poem of, on Rood of Ruthwell, i. 108-9.
Cyrus, St., *see* Grig.

Dalriada, in Ireland, i. 22.
—— in Scotland, organized and made independent by Columba, i. 61; subjected to Northumbrians, i. 73; subject to Picts, 113.
Dalriads, migrations to Scotland, i. 22-5, 51.
Damasus, Bishop, i. 14-15.
David, St., patron of Kentigern, i. 20.
—— I, king of Scotland, i. 12, 163; Battle of the Standard, i. 163, 184; Anglicizes laws, etc., i. 163; sets up diocesan episcopacy, i. 164; 'soir sanct for the crown,' i. 171 *n.* 1; resists the Archbishop of York, i. 184; favours the antipope, i. 184; regains Papal favour, i. 185.
—— II (Bruce), king of Scotland, i. 264; his captivity, i. 277; battles of Halidon Hill and Neville's Cross, i. 277; coronation oath to root out heretics, i. 279; Pope annuls his divorce from Margaret Logie, i. 280; contributes willingly to the Pope, i. 286; encroachments on Church property, i. 288; gives up right to bishops' estates, i. 289.
Dawstane Rigg, battle of, i. 73.
Death-penalty for saying mass, ii. 144; almost no bloodshed at Reformation, ii. 145.
Deer, Columban settlement at, i. 62; *Book of Deer*, i. 60, 142.
Deira, kingdom of, i. 17.
Derry, foundation of monastery, i. 49.
Diarmait, king of Meath, i. 50, 59.
Discipline, First Book of, first mention of, on April 29, ii. 134; prepared by Knox and five Ministers, ii. 160; presented to Lords of Articles, ii. 161 and *n.*; materials used, ii. 161 and *n.*; its originality, ii. 161; everything at variance with the Gospel to be

suppressed, ii. 162; popular election of ministers, ii. 163; the admission and character of ministers, ii. 163; readers and exhorters, ii. 164; eldership, ii. 164; superintendents, ii. 138, 166; not diocesan bishops, ii. 167 and *n.*; absence of presbyterian theory, ii. 168; democratic character, ii. 169; provisions for education, ii. 170; 'exercises,' ii. 171; discipline, ii. 172; excommunication, ii. 172-3; family religion, ii. 173; finance, ii. 174; Church funds to be used for clergy, education and the poor, ii. 175; deacons to allocate endowments, ii. 175; called by nobles 'a devout imagination,' ii. 176; accepted by the Church, ii. 176; its extravagances, ii. 177 *n.*

Donnan, St., i. 58-9.

Douglas, Gavin, bishop of Dunkeld, i. 403-4; conflict with Forman, i. 405.

—— John, Reformer, defended by Earl of Argyll, ii. 40; preaches in Scotland, ii. 57.

D'Oyssel, a Frenchman, made Minister of State, ii. 21.

Drostan, St., i. 142.

Druidism, origin of, i. 3; derivation of 'druid,' i. 3 *n.* 2; effect of Roman invasion on, i. 4; functions of druids, i. 3; religious beliefs of, i. 3-4; distinctive characteristics of Scottish, i. 4; in Ireland, i. 29, 33; in Iona, i. 51 *n.* 3; in Pictland, overthrown by Columba, i. 59-60.

Drumceatt, conclave of, i. 61.

Dryburgh Abbey, burnt by English in 1385, i. 304; destroyed by English, i. 468.

Dull, Celtic settlement at, i. 81, 98.

Dumbarton, *see* Alcluyd.

Dunbar, Gavin, archbishop of Glasgow, i. 468; conflict with Beaton, i. 469; no punishment, i. 470.

—— Wilfrid imprisoned at, i. 104 *n.* 2; monastery destroyed, i. 113.

—— William, his poetry, i. 391; religious feeling, i. 392; poem on *The Passioun of Christ*, i. 392, 395 and Note M.

Dunblane, bishopric, i. 134, 166; Clement (bishop), 198 *n.* 1; gives account of its ruined state, i. 207; foundation of cathedral, i. 207.

Duncan, first Rex Scotiae, i. 119; murdered by Macbeth, i. 119.

Dundee, headquarters of Franciscan Friars, i. 295; friars threatened with starvation about 1500, i. 364; relation to Lindores Abbey, i. 443-4; friaries destroyed, i. 446; population about 1550, ii. 5; Town Council defend their school against Archbishop's Court, ii. 58; possibly first place where elders were appointed, ii. 74, 75 *n.*

Dunfermline Abbey, founded by Queen Margaret, i. 175; its endowments, i. 175-7.

Dunkeld, becomes religious capital of Alban, i. 113-14; abandoned as capital because ruined by Danes, i. 121; bishopric of, A.D. 1127, i. 165; excellent bishops, i. 208; Bishop Hugh grants church of Madderty to Inchaffray abbey, i. 222; disorders in Perthshire in fifteenth century, i. 361; Gavin Douglas made bishop, i. 404; George Browne a good bishop, i. 409.

Duns Scotus, a pilgrim student, i. 270.

Dunstan, St., i. 130, 133.

Durham, mother-church of, i. 82 *n.* 3.

Durrow, foundation of monastery, i. 49.

Durrow, Book of, i. 49 *n.* 2.

Eadbald, king of Kent, i. 75.

Eadbert, king of Northumbria, i. 107.

Eadmer, appointed to St. Andrews but resigns, i. 181.

Eanfled, queen of Bernicia, i. 91-2.

Easter, date of celebration, i. 38-9, 44, 55-6, 67, 87-8, 93-6.

Eata, abbot of Melrose, i. 81, 82, 96, 105.

Ebba, abbess of Coldingham, i. 80.

Ecgbert, brings Iona under Roman Obedience, i. 99-100.

Ecgfrith, king of Northumbria, i. 106.

Edgar, king of Scots, cruelty to uncle, i. 161; grants charter to Coldingham, i. 169.

Edinburgh, derivation of the name, i. 75 *n.* 2; dedication to Cuthbert, 106; (Dunedin), abandoned to

the Scots, i. 118; Lothian annexed to Scotland, i. 118; capital of Edgar, i. 161; burnt by English in 1385, i. 304; in 1385 had four hundred hovel-like houses, i. 305; St. Giles' Church rebuilt 1419 and made collegiate church, i. 317-18, and Note K, i. 331; freed from St. Andrews, i. 318; Trinity Hospital founded, i. 388; defends friars and devoted to Beaton, i. 446; captured by English, i. 468; population about 1550, ii. 5; friaries destroyed and Knox preaches in St. Giles', ii. 106; Knox chosen minister of, ii. 106 and *n.*; retaken by Regent, ii. 124; St. Giles' 'cleansed,' ii. 126; anew purged by the Congregation, ii. 132; action by Town Council against idolaters and harlots, ii. 135.

Education in Scotic Church, i. 42; schools under Celtic Church, i. 141; few monasteries had schools, i. 201; about A.D. 1300, i. 202; arrested by war of independence, i. 269; Scottish students in Paris and Oxford, i. 295-6; cathedrals or abbeys did little for learning, i. 321; in A.D. 1500 the study of literature forgotten in Aberdeen, i. 364; care for, by Observant Franciscans, i. 366; new schools founded about A.D. 1500, i. 375; Act for education of barons' sons, i. 376; more widely spread than in Europe, i. 414 *n.*; passing into the hands of the burghs, ii. 5; arrangements for, in Book of Discipline, ii. 170; Knox's service to, ii. 170 *n.*; universities to have the funds of bishops, deans, etc., ii. 175.

Edward I, king of England, makes the Pope abandon the Scottish cause, i. 257; Pope acknowledges, as king of Scotland, i. 258 *n.*; probably destroyed Dunfermline monastery, i. 267.

—— II, king of England, i. 258; has to make peace, i. 261; army destroys Holyrood, Melrose and Dryburgh, i. 267.

—— III, king of England, wastes churches, i. 290.

—— VI, king of England, ii. 16; his reforms, ii. 16.

Edwin, first Christian king of Northumbria, i. 75-6.

Egbert, bishop of York, receives *pallium* from Pope, i. 107.

Eigg, Columban settlement, i. 58; monks murdered by pirates, i. 73.

Elders in Scottish Church, ii. 75-6; their functions, ii. 77, 164.

Elizabeth, queen of England, ascends throne, ii. 16; religious attitude, ii. 17, 114; policy to Scotland, ii. 113; dislike of Knox, ii. 114; duplicity towards the Congregation, ii. 128; sends a small army and navy to Scotland, ii. 128; double attitude towards France, ii. 132.

Elphinstone, William, bishop of Aberdeen, his character, i. 335-6, 367; his deeds and learning, also his nepotism, i. 367, 368, 369; founds University in 1494-5, i. 378; added College of St. Mary, i. 379; appointed Archbishop of St. Andrews, but died before installation, i. 404.

England (Church of), Romanization of, i. 103-6; severed from the Scottish Church, i. 106-7; evangelized by Celtic Church, i. 77-80, 82-4; progress of Reformation in, ii. 16; agreement of the 39 Articles with Scots Confession, ii. 159.

English, influx into Lothians, i. 173; archbishops claim rights over Scottish Church, i. 179; invasion of 1385, destruction of abbeys and towns, i. 304; give help to Scots Reformation, ii. 116, 121, 128, 130.

Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum, i 400.

Erasmus, Desiderius, opinion of Alexander Stewart, Primate, i. 355; saying about priests and monks, i. 370; epistles of, i. 383 *n.*; degeneration of Christianity, i. 391; *Praise of Folly*, i. 400, 412, 446; ii. 3.

Erskine, John, of Dun, ii. 5, 6; Knox preaches in his Edinburgh house, ii. 70; informal Covenant at Dun, ii. 71; goes to Stirling to interview the Regent, i. 101.

Essex, conversion of, i. 83.

Ethelberga, queen of Northumbria, i. 75-6.

Ethelbert, king of Kent, i. 74-5.

Ethelfreda, queen of East Anglia, i. 104.
Ethelfrid, king of Northumbria, i. 73, 75.
Eugenius I, Pope, honours Wilfrid, i. 92.
—— IV, Pope, sends commissioners to order Scots' Church affairs, i. 338; King and clergy to meet them in Parliament, i. 339.
Excommunication, or 'general cursing,' i. 370; read in diocese of Aberdeen four times a year, i. 370; offences cursed, i. 370; curses pronounced, i. 371; little effect, i. 371; in Reformed Church, ii. 172-3.
'Exercises,' to be held in towns for Scripture study, ii. 171; attendance compulsory, ii. 171; not so much for religious fellowship as for knowledge, ii. 171.

Farne Island, Cuthbert's life on, i. 105-6.
Ferdinand I, emperor of Germany, makes war on the Pope, ii. 14.
Ferleiginn, i. 129, 140.
Fillan, St., i. 97.
Finan, abbot of Lindisfarne, i. 78 *n.* 2, 82, 92.
Findchan, St., i. 59.
Finnian, St., i. 45-6, 49.
Fordun, John (chantry priest of Aberdeen), the chronicler, i. 10, 24; *Chronicles*, i. 298; his extravagances, i. 298-9.
Foreign trade and commerce in reign of James V, i. 413; Scots abroad, i. 413; ii. 7; trading classes study the Bible, i. 460.
Forman, Andrew, appointed archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 404; his conflict with Hepburn and Douglas, i. 405; declares that Popes had authority in civil and criminal cases, only in Papal States, i. 409; his Synodal Constitutions and Ordinances, i. 410.
Forrest, Henry, burned for possessing New Testament, i. 453.
Forret, Thomas, vicar of Dollar, accused of reading Old and New Testament, i. 457; hanged and burned, i. 458.
Forteviot, capital of Fortrenn, i. 114.
Fortrenn, name for Pictland, i. 114, 120, 134.
Fothadh, Celtic bishop of St. Andrews, i. 154.
France, agrees to defend Scots from England, ii. 18; lands troops, ii. 19; quarrels between French and Scots, ii. 21; desire to master Scotland, ii. 112; difficulty for Scotland to resist, ii. 113; after treaty of Berwick saw that Scotland would be Protestant, ii. 131; troops of, finally leave, ii. 137.
Fraser, William, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 253; favours English cause, i. 253.
French King's influence on Church, i. 281; ecclesiastics appointed, i. 281; colleges petition for Scots' benefices, i. 284; accounts of Scottish poverty in 1385, i. 305; Scots give assistance against England, i. 305; Reformed Synod and *Confessio Gallica*, ii. 15.
Fursey, St., i. 70 *n.* 1.

Gaels, *see* Goydels.
Gallican Liturgy, probably used in Celtic Church, i. 138.
Galloway, early inhabitants of, i. 5 *n.* 2; distinctive character of, i. 12, 109; Church accepts Roman usages, i. 109.
—— bishopric re-erected before 731, i. 109; last Anglo-Saxon bishop died A.D. 803, i. 109.
—— or Candida Casa, bishopric, revived A.D. 1125 under primacy of York, i. 205; subject to St. Andrews, i. 358; bishop a suffragan of Glasgow, i. 359.
Geneva, headquarters of Protestantism, ii. 15; Knox minister at, ii. 68.
Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, i. 9.
Germany, Northumbrian missions to, i. 107.
Gilbert, St., bishop of Caithness, i. 206.
Gildas, the chronicler, i. 40 *n.* 1.
Giles' (or Aegidius), St., Church in Edinburgh, i. 317, 318, 331; riot about the image of, ii. 89.
Glasgow, bishopric, story of foundation by Kentigern, i. 21-2; independence of York, i. 25-6; foundation of cathedral, i. 26, 135; holy stone of St. Mungo, i. 147; cathedral destroyed, i. 165, 166, 167; struggle about investitures,

i. 182-3; declared by Pope subject to York, i. 183; new cathedral begun, i. 209; collections to help in building cathedral, i. 209; bad adjustment of revenues, i. 210; Bishop Jocelyn, i. 228; bishopric reserved to Pope, i. 265, 280 *n.*; Bishop Blacader opposes archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 350-1; made an archbishopric, i. 352; University founded, i. 378; inefficiency of University, i. 412; archbishop's conflict with Beaton, i. 469.
Glasgow, city, founded by Kentigern, i. 20; rise of burgh, i. 26.
Glasnevin, school of, i. 49.
Glencairn, Earl of, leader of Congregation, ii. 58; Knox visits, ii. 70; drew rents from glebes, ii. 174.
Goodman, Christopher, colleague to Knox in Geneva, comes to Scotland, ii. 122; preaches in Edinburgh, ii. 122; 'odiose' in England, ii. 126.
Gordon, Alexander, archbishop of Athens, ii. 35, 125.
Goydels, in Scotland and in Ireland, i. 2-3, 22.
Graham, Patrick, archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 344, 346; indiscreet use of authority, i. 347; condemned as heretic, i. 348; died in prison at Lochleven, i. 348; was he a real Reformer? i. 349.
Gratian, Decretum concerning clerical immorality, i. 248.
Greenlaw, William, papal collector, i. 287; trustworthy administrator, i. 287.
Gregory the Great, Pope, i. 44, 74, 90, 105.
Gregory II, Pope, i. 109.
Greyfriars make over lands to laymen for a consideration, ii. 37; monastery destroyed in Perth, ii. 102.
Grig (or Cyrus), king of Scotland, gives liberty to the Scottish Church, A.D. 877, i. 120.

HADRIAN'S WALL, i. 4-6, 10.
Hamilton, James, Earl of Arran, afterwards Duke of Chatelherault, made Regent, i. 436; weakness and indecision, i. 438; ii. 18, 21, 123, 125, 127 *n.*
Hamilton, John, archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 438; publishes Catechism, i. 483; executed, i. 483; his character, ii. 25, 30; proceedings against heresy, ii. 25; his Catechism, ii. 30; its character and contents, ii. 31; rules for reading it, etc., ii. 33; his immoralities, ii. 25, 35 *n.*; opposes Confession of Faith very weakly, ii. 142; writes to archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 146.
—— Patrick, Reformer of Scotland, thesis at Marburg, i. 402, 417; abbot of Ferne, 417; at Paris and St. Andrews Universities, i. 417; ordained or not? i. 418 *n.*; summoned by James Beaton, i. 418; goes to Marburg, '*Patrick's Places*,' i. 418; return to Scotland, i. 419; conference with Beaton, i. 419; charges against, i. 420; martyrdom, i. 421-2; influence of his death, i. 423.
Harlaw, battle of, 1412, its importance, i. 305.
—— William, Reform preacher, ii. 57, 74.
Heathfield, battle of, i. 76.
Heavenfield, battle of, i. 77, 83.
Henry VIII, king of England, tries to put down heresy, i. 427-8; seeks divorce from Queen Katharine, i. 428; frees English Church from Rome, i. 428; marries Anne Boleyn, i. 428; executes Fisher and More, i. 429; dissolves monasteries, i. 429; *Articles* devised and *King's Book*, i. 429; sanctions use of Bible in English, i. 429; restrictions as to Bible reading, i. 430; sends Barlow to James V, i. 431; sends Sadleyr to Scotland, i. 433; conflict with Beaton, i. 436; army invades Scotland, i. 468; promises assistance to Beaton's murderers, ii. 18.
Henryson, Robert, Scottish poet, i. 386, 387.
Hepburn, Patrick, bishop of Moray, his immorality, ii. 34.
Hertford, Earl of, Duke of Somerset, gains battle of Pinkie, ii. 19; sends preachers to Scotland and circulates Bibles, ii. 19, 20; burns ecclesiastical buildings, ii. 21.
Hewalds, missions to Europe, i. 107.
Hexham, Cuthbert appointed bishop of, i. 105-6.

Hilda, abbess of Whitby, i. 93.
Hoddom, Hill of, Kentigern's ministry at, i. 21.
Holy wells, healing at, i. 147.
Holyrood Abbey, founded 1128, i. 171 and *n.*
Honorius, Emperor, i. 7.
—— I, Pope, i. 91.
—— II, Pope, despatches a cardinal to Scotland to administer Church affairs, i. 178 *n.*
—— III, Pope, grants a Provincial Council to Scots Church, i. 238;
Hospitals, i. 174 *n.*, 388.
Hus, John, opinions for which he was condemned, i. 328.
Hutten, Ulrich von, i. 400; ii. 5.
Hymns, use of, in Celtic Church, i. 53-4.

Iconoclasm, first traces in Scotland, ii. 43, 77; English crusade against images, ii. 77; attack on image of St. Giles, ii. 78, 89.
Inchcolm, priory founded on, i. 162.
Innisboffin, Iona monks retire to, i. 97.
Innocent III, Pope, issues a bull against duelling in England and Scotland, i. 247.
—— VIII, Pope, sends *Legatus a latere* to Scotland, i. 350; gives the King bull of privilege, 1487, i. 351.
Interdict, laid on Scotland by Pope, i. 230; another threatened, i. 232; effect of, i. 269; laid on Scotland for Beaton's arrest, i. 437.
Interims of 1548, ii. 14.
Investitures controversy in Scotland, i. 181.
Iona—druidism on, i. 51 *n.* 3; natural features, i. 52; Columba's settlement, i. 52-7; missions sent to Scotland, i. 57-62; organization of the community, i. 54; the *matrix ecclesia*, i. 58, 71-2, 78, 82, 86 *n.* 2; first coronation at, i. 61; the name, i. 68; Columba's prophecy, i. 69, 98; Council of Seniors at, i. 71, 82, 86; comes under Roman Obedience, i. 99-100; devastated by Danes and Norsemen, i. 100, 109-10, 113; legend of Nechtan's burial at, i. 112; ceases to be religious capital of Scotland, i. 113; lost distinction in eighth century, i. 134, 138, 139; monastery erected by Queen Margaret, i. 160, 186 *n.*; later history, i. 249; Benedictines erect a monastery, i. 250; destruction of buildings by Ulstermen, i. 250; abbey rebuilt in the thirteenth century, i. 250; seat of bishop of Sudreys (or the Isles) for a time, i. 360; abbots under Dunkeld and Glasgow, i. 360.
Iona Mission—spirit and method of, i. 71-4, 90; progress in Northumbria, i. 76-80; progress in Lothians, i. 80-2; progress in S. Britain, i. 82-4; saintly character of missionaries, i. 85, 98; want of permanence, i. 101-2.
Ireland—druidism in, i. 29; Celtic inhabitants, i. 2, 4; raids upon, from Britain, i. 19; early migrations to Scotland, i. 22-5; extent of their religious influence, i. 22, 24-5; mission of Palladius, i. 23-4; home of Scottish Christianity, i. 29, 37; conversion of, i. 29-30.
—— Scotic Church in—founded by St. Patrick, i. 29-37; episcopacy in, i. 29, 36-9, 41; relation to Rome, i. 37, 46, 86, 90-1, 98; becomes monastic, i. 37-41; language of, i. 37 *n.* 2; position of women, 38; date of Easter, i. 38-9, 44; spiritual independence, i. 39, 41; organization, i. 41, 72 *n.* 1; Church buildings, i. 41; culture in, 41-2; foreign missions of, i. 42-7, 70 *n.* 1, 84; cells in, i. 52 *n.* 5; clan feuds, i. 58-9; irregular usages, i. 70 *n.* 1; ordination, i. 70; relation to Celtic Church in Scotland, i. 70; Catalogue of Saints of Hibernia, i. 37-9, 72; Twelve Apostles of Erin, i. 46, 49.
Irish Annals, i. 110.
Irving, Edward, on Scottish Confession, ii. 157 *n.*
Isabella, queen of Robert Bruce, applies for papal absolution of clerics, i. 269.
Islay, Columban settlement, i. 58.

James, deacon, helps Paulinus in Northumbria, i. 76, 83 *n.*, 91.
James I, king of Scotland, captured by English, i. 304; returns after payment of expenses, i. 305; character of his reign, i. 333; works for 'freedom of haly kirk,' i. 337; attempts at reform, i. 337; regulates appeals to Pope,

i. 338; letter to Council of Basel, i. 340; favours St. Andrews University, i. 376-7.
James II, king of Scotland, i. 334; commission to settle claims to property of deceased bishops, i. 343; renounces his claim, i. 343; yet disposed of benefices and administered estates, i. 343.
—— III, king of Scotland, i. 334; annexes Orkney, i. 334; appeals to Rome, i. 334, 350; Pope grants absolution to his murderers, i. 335; presented with Golden Rose, i. 350.
—— IV, king of Scotland, ally of France, i. 335; marries daughter of Henry VII, i. 335; gifts from Pope Julius II, i. 335; Flodden, i. 335; appoints his brother Primate at St. Andrews, i. 354; his religion and immorality, i. 390; pilgrimages, i. 390.
—— V, king of Scotland, i. 402, 408; opposition to 'lutherism' i. 416; suppresses disorders, i. 430; founds College of Justice, i. 430; levies unpopular tax, i. 431; receives decorations from Emperor, i. 431; refuses to meet Henry VIII, i. 432-4; marriages, i. 432; Solway Moss, i. 434; threats to kirkmen, i. 459; receives list of 350 heretical gentry, i. 462.
Jedburgh, subject to Lindisfarne, i. 108.
Jerome, St., i. 6, 8.
Jewel, Bishop, statements about Scottish Reformation, ii. 109 *n.*
Joan, queen of David II, i. 288.
Jocelyn, bishop of Glasgow, i. 25-7.
—— of Furness, i. 26, 62 *n.* 1.
John the Scot, i. 43 *n.* 3.
John XXII, Pope, summons Scottish bishops to Avignon, i. 261; Scottish Estates' appeal on behalf of Bruce, i. 261; acknowledges Bruce, i. 263; deals with consecration of bishops, i. 264; remonstrates with Bruce for presenting to benefices, i. 267; horror at Scots' king's attitude, i. 274.
—— XXIII, Pope, a man whose election 'shocks belief,' i. 303; sends legate to Scotland to absolve, i. 307; deposed in 1415 by Council of Constance, i. 328 *n.*
Julius II, Pope, i. 335; Council of the Lateran, i. 356.
Justification by Faith, Lutheran doctrine of, in Hamilton's Catechism, ii. 32.
Jutes, *see* Teutonic invasions.

Kells, monastery of, i. 49; erected into a primacy, i. 113.
Kells, Book of, i. 49 *n.* 2.
Kelso Abbey, might take sacraments from any bishop, i. 178; receives Lesmahagow church, i. 178; plundered by English and Scots, i. 407; desires a warrior abbot, i. 407; abbey destroyed by English, i. 468.
Kennedy, James, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 334; formerly of Dunkeld, i. 334; the foremost Scottish statesman of his time, i. 334, 367; founds St. Salvator's College, i. 377.
Kennedy, Quintin, commendator of Crossraguell Abbey, his *Compendius Tractive*, ii. 37; speaks of ignorance of clergy, ii. 38; the ruining of the Church, ii. 38; only Church rulers should correct abuses, ii. 38, 39; says the Church is the Christian congregation, ii. 39; on Scripture reading, ii. 39; conference with Willock proposed, ii. 90.
Kenneth MacAlpin, first Scottish king of Alban, i. 113-14.
Kentigern, St. (Mungo), origin, i. 19-20; mission in Strathclyde, i. 20, 21; exile in Wales, i. 17 *n.* 3, 20-1, 25; mission in Dumfriesshire, i. 21; disappearance of his mission, i. 21-2; consecration, i. 20-2, 25; visited by Columba, 22, 26, 62 *n.* 1; legends of, 25-7; *Life* by Jocelyn, i. 127; reputed bishop of Glasgow, i. 135, 143 *n.*
Kentigerna, sister of St. Comgan, missionary from Ireland, i. 97.
Kildare, monastery, i. 27.
Kilrymont, first mention of abbacy, i. 113. *See also* St. Andrews.
Kingussie, dedication to Columba at, i. 60.
Kirkaldy, Sir William, of Grange, a prisoner in the galleys, ii. 53; character, ii. 59; writes about 'cleansing' of churches, ii. 108; fights valiantly against the French, ii. 129.

Kirkcudbright, St. Cuthbert's mission, i. 81, 106.
Kirkmadrine, inscription at, i. 13-14.
Knox, John, *Historie* mentions the burning of an early heretic, i. 380 *n.*; account of the charges against Lollards of Kyle, i. 383; remarks on Patrick Hamilton's martyrdom, i. 424; Lang's criticism as to ignorance of the mystic charm of Rome, i. 485; arrival in Edinburgh, 1559, ii. 47; birth and early life, ii. 50; call to preach, ii. 51; taken prisoner by the French, ii. 53; life in the galleys, 53; released and goes to England, ii. 55; licensed as a preacher in England, ii. 60; at Berwick and Newcastle, ii. 60; refuses Allhallows Church, ii. 61; refuses bishopric of Rochester, ii. 61; his reasons, ii. 62 and *n.*; influence on Anglican Church, ii. 64; views on the Lord's Supper, ii. 63; proposal to divide bishoprics, ii. 62 *n.*; 'Black Rubric,' ii. 64; letter to Berwick, ii. 65; goes to Switzerland, ii. 65; dissensions at Frankfort, ii. 67; rejects English Prayer Book, ii. 67; minister at Geneva, ii. 68; friendship with Mrs. Bowes, ii. 68; marriage, ii. 69 and *n.* 1; preaches in Edinburgh, etc., ii. 69; argument with Maitland about St. Paul, ii. 70; writes to Regent, ii. 71; goes back to Geneva, ii. 74; letters of counsel sent, ii. 72-3; work at Geneva, ii. 74; recalled by barons, ii. 79; sends letters from Dieppe, ii. 83; writes the *Monstruous Regiment of Women*, ii. 84; Appellation to the nobility, ii. 85; letter to Commonalty, ii. 86-7; at Dieppe, ii. 92; letters to Cecil and to Scotland, ii. 93; his qualities, ii. 99; preaches in Perth, outbreak against monasteries, ii. 101; principle about 'cleansing' the churches, ii. 106; exaggerated accounts of the destruction of churches, ii. 109 and *n.*; requests help from England, ii. 115; disapproved of English Reformation and Prayer Book, ii. 116; apologizes to Elizabeth, ii. 117-18; doubtful conduct as to English help, ii. 126; superseded by Lethington, ii. 126; preaches at Cupar with great effect, ii. 130; thanksgiving for amity with England, ii. 138; sermon at opening of Parliament, ii. 141; along with Wynram and four others draws up Confession of Faith, ii. 141; prepares *History* as a defence of the Lords, ii. 149 and *n.*; its character, ii. 149; Lords' rejection of Book of Discipline, ii. 176; his severity, ii. 107.

Lambert, Francis, of Avignon, at Marburg, i. 418.
Lamberton, William, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 253; crowns Bruce, i. 254; character, i. 255; confirmed by Pope as bishop, i. 257; death, i. 268.
Largs, battle of, i. 194.
Lateran Council, Fourth, i. 236, 237, 240.
Laurentius, mission to Britain, i. 90.
Leith, battles round, between the French and Scots, ii. 125, 129; English send succour, ii. 130.
Leo x, Pope, behaviour to Luther, i. 401; acknowledged in Scotland after some delay, i. 408.
Lesley, John, bishop of Ross, *History of Scotland* quoted, i. 363 *n.*; ii. 46 *n.* 4; tells of portents in 1559, ii. 45; alleges that churchmen were alarmed at the Council's reforms and so became Protestant, ii. 46 *n.* 2, 47; speaks contemptuously of Reformed preachers, ii. 57.
Leslie, Norman, i. 472; murders Beaton, along with others, i. 480; declared an outlaw, ii. 18.
Lindisfarne, St. Aidan's mission, i. 78-84; comes under Roman Obedience, i. 96-7; Eata appointed abbot, i. 105; Cuthbert appointed prior, i. 105; Cuthbert appointed bishop, i. 105-6; despoiled by Scots, i. 118; *Gospel of Lindisfarne*, i. 139.
Lindores Abbey, endowments, i. 199, 200; the Dundee church assigned to, i. 221; controversy about stipend, i. 221; Abbot Laurence, Inquisitor of heresy, i. 326; arguments against Resby, i. 327; poverty of monks, i. 364; Laurence's zeal as Inquisitor, i.

380; tries to confute P. Crawar, i. 382; history of abbey, i. 443; sacked and monks driven out, i. 444; a second 'cleansing,' ii. 105.
Lochleven, i. 348. *See also* St. Serf's.
Logie, Gavin, principal of St. Leonards, i. 412, 453 and *n.*, 464.
Lollards in Scotland, i. 323-4, 325; heresy condemned by Parliament, i. 325; J. Resby, i. 326; in England, fate of Sir J. Oldcastle, i. 379; of Kyle, thirty impeached before James IV, i. 383; importance of the trial, i. 385; not forerunners of the Lutheran Reformers, i. 386.
Lollius Urbicus, erects Wall of Antonine, i. 5.
Lords of the Congregation—first protest to the Regent, ii. 43; men of varied character, ii. 58; first national Covenant, ii. 78-9; name explained, ii. 80; first proposals for Reformation, ii. 81; churchmen's rejoinder, ii. 82; Regent's toleration, ii. 82-3; memorial to Parliament, ii. 89; publish three manifestoes at Perth, ii. 102; Lord James Stewart and Argyll join them in a covenant, ii. 103-4; suspend Regent and form a Government, ii. 124; covenant to expel French, ii. 133; requests for settlement of treaty with England, ii. 136; that Parliament meet on July 10, 1559, ii. 137; treaty of Edinburgh concluded, ii. 136; important provisions, ii. 137; call themselves Great Council of Scotland, ii. 139; supplication to Parliament for a Reformation, ii. 139.
Lord's Supper, observance in Celtic Church, i. 54-5; observance in Scotic Church, i. 55; in Reformed Church, ii. 154.
Lothians, under rule of Northumbria, i. 17; Romanization of Church in, i. 104-6; evangelized from Northumbria, i. 108-9.
Loyola, Ignatius, founds Society of Jesus, i. 426, 470; death, ii. 13.
Lucius, legend of, i. 7.
Luther, Martin, breach with Rome, i. 401; his doctrine at Oxford in 1521, i. 415; books circulating, i. 415; processes against his followers in England, i. 415; act of Scots parliament against 'lutherism,' i. 416; books, etc., shipped to Leith or Aberdeen, i. 452, 453; 70 Lutherans apprehended near St. Andrews, i. 453; early Scots Reformers Lutheran, later followed the Swiss, i. 484; his death, i. 484 *n.*; literature introduced, ii. 7; teaching on Lord's Supper, ii. 14; debt of Scotland to, ii. 15.
Luxeuil, monastery of, i. 44.
Lyndsay, Sir David, of the Mount, poet, writes of low state of nunneries, i. 444; the Sciennes nunnery an exception, i. 444; his *Dreme*, i. 445; *Satire of the Three Estates*, i. 448; advocates reforms, i. 449; Sir W. Scott on, i. 449; *Tragedie of the Cardinall*, i. 481, ii. 2; *Satire*, ii. 8.

Macbeth, king of Scots, distributes money at Rome, i. 123; gives benefactions to the Church, i. 122, 126 *n.* 1.
Machabaeus, or M'Alpine, John, goes to Wittenberg, then takes a high place in Denmark, i. 452.
Maelrubha, mission in Scotland, i. 97.
Maitland, William, yr., of Lethington, ii. 23; political inconsistencies, ii. 59; secretary of state to Mary the Regent, ii. 59; generally favourable to Reformation, ii. 59; argument with Knox about the mass, ii. 70; secretary to the Lords of the Congregation, ii. 125.
Major, John, of St. Andrews, i. 412; congratulates Beaton on his zeal, i. 423; gives an account of religious houses founded by King David I, i. 443; apology for Scotsmen, ii. 3, 4.
Malcolm Canmore, king of Scotland, slays Macbeth, i. 119; marries Queen Margaret, i. 155; invades England five times, i. 154; resists Anglicizing, i. 154.
Margaret, St., queen of Scotland, i. 153, 155; marriage to Malcolm, i. 155; her piety, i. 156; influence over her husband, i. 157; care for her children, i. 157; death, i. 157; dealing with Celtic monks, i. 158; her view of the

Lord's Supper, i. 159; new foundations by, i. 160, 249; founds Dunfermline Abbey, i. 175.
Marriage laws, Pope's intervention practically suspended about 1300, i. 266; dispensations from, asked of the Popes, i. 284-5.
Martin, St., bishop of Tours, i. 11-13.
—— v, Pope, brings Scotland back to papacy, i. 314-16; wise behaviour as to antipope, i. 316; still continues old policy, i. 316.
Mary of Lorraine, made Regent, ii. 21; Knox compares to an unruly cow, ii. 22; supported by Scottish reform party, ii. 22; kept up many pretences, ii. 33; her change of policy, ii. 42-3; professed displeasure at Mill's execution, ii. 42, 83; conversation with Chalmers, ii. 88; fails to keep her promises, ii. 91; finds opposition in Perth and Dundee, ii. 101-2; breaks her word to the Lords, ii. 104 and *n.*; expects French force to help her, ii. 115; fortifies Leith, ii. 118; suspended from Regency, ii. 124; retakes Edinburgh, ii. 126; final activity, ii. 129; exults over 'John Knox's God,' ii. 130; death and character, ii. 135.
Mary Stewart, queen of Scots, convoyed to France, ii. 20; married to French Dauphin, ii. 22; becomes Queen of France, ii. 117; with Francis, gives leave for a Parliament, ii. 137.
—— Tudor, queen of England, reaction under, ii. 16; persecution by, ii. 16 and *n.* 3.
Maserfield, battle of, i. 83.
Mass, celebration of, in Scotic Church, i. 38-9.
Maxton, dedication to Cuthbert, i. 106.
May, Isle of, legend of Bohemian settlement, i. 112.
Mayo, monastery of, i. 97.
Mearns, legend of St. Pallad, i. 23-4.
Melrose, Celtic monastery and mission, i. 80-2; relation to Lindisfarne, i. 105 *n.* 2, 108; Latin monastery destroyed, i. 113; abbey of, founded about 1130, i. 171; St. Waltheve, abbot, i. 202-3; *Melrose Chronicle*, quoted, i. 244 *n.*; Bruce sets apart money for its repair, i. 272; burnt by English, 1385, i. 304; destroyed by English, i. 468.
Melville, James, Observant Friar, his bold challenge, i. 414, 445 *n.* 1.
Mendicant Friars, i. 197-8; very patriotic under Bruce, i. 294; efficiency in fourteenth century, i. 295; deterioration about 1500, i. 364; Observant Franciscans useful and popular, i. 365.
Mercia, conversion of, i. 83.
Methven, Paul, Reform preacher, of Dundee, ii. 57, 74.
Michael Scotus, i. 202 and *n.*
Military Orders (Templars and Hospitallers), i. 917.
Mill or Myln, Walter, last martyr, ii. 40; burnt at St. Andrews, dying prediction, ii. 41.
Ministers, election and admission of, ii. 163-4.
Moluag, St., i. 45, 58.
Monastic buildings, of Celtic Church and later, i. 136; churches of wood, 'mos Scoticus,' i. 136; erection of abbeys, monasteries, etc., i. 200.
—— Orders, introduced, i. 171-2; rivet the authority of Rome, i. 193; rapid progress, i. 196; system interfered with Church regulations, i. 225; life of, in fifteenth century, i. 362; disorders among abbots and priors, i. 363; James IV said Franciscans were a decaying flock, i. 365; poverty of monks, i. 363; Observant Franciscans arrive in Scotland, 1447, i. 365; their zeal, i. 365; James IV's laudation, i. 366, 445.
Monasticism, in Latin and Greek Christendom, i. 39-40; universality of, i. 40; distinctive features in Scotic Church, i. 40-1.
Monenna, St., i. 22-3.
Mons Graupius, battle of, i. 4.
Monumental art of the Celtic Church, i. 144-5.
Monymusk, Culdee settlement, i. 188.
Moray, bishopric, i. 165; disorders about 1400, i. 304.
—— Thomas Randolph, Earl of, sent to Pope at Avignon, i. 262; gets Bruce acknowledged, i. 263.
—— Earl of, the Good Regent, *see* Stewart, James.

More, Sir Thomas, appointed to reply to Lutheranism, i. 415; death, i. 429.
Moville, monastery of, i. 42, 48, 49-50.
Mungo, St., *see* Kentigern.
Myln, Alexander, abbot of Cambuskenneth, i. 364, 409.
Mystics, Eckhart, Suso and Tauler, i. 278.

Nechtan, king of the Picts, i. 99; legend of his return to Columban usages, i. 112.
Nechtansmere, battle of, i. 106-7.
New Testament, if Regent oppose the reading of it the kirkmen promise her 10,000 pounds Scots, ii. 24.
Newbottle Abbey, burnt by English, 1385, i. 304.
Niall, High-king of Ireland, i. 48.
Nicholas IV, Pope, protests against the Crown appropriating revenues of vacant bishoprics, i. 267.
Ninian, St., mission at Whithorn, i. 11-14; its duration, i. 15, 18-19, 25; dedications to, i. 13, 15; connection with Rome, i. 13-15; extent of his fame, i. 13, 18.
Norsemen, invasions of Britain, i. 107-8, 110-11; invade Northumbria, i. 117.
Northumbria, kingdom of, i. 17, 18; conversion of, i. 75-80; Romanization of Church, i. 104-6; in Dark Age, i. 106-8.
Nunneries, in Celtic Church, i. 62 *n.* 3.

Occam, William of, on freedom of the state, i. 278.
Ogham script, i. 141, 145.
Orange, Council of, i. 46.
Ordination, in Celtic Church, i. 54.
Origen, mention of Britons, i. 7.
Orkney, bishopric, A.D. 1055, i. 167; subject to Norway, i. 204; subject to St. Andrews, 1472, i. 346; 358; for some years still Scandinavian, i. 358.
Oswald, king of Northumbria—flight to Iona, i. 73-5; evangelization of Northumbria, i. 77-9.
Oswin, king of Deira, i. 79-80, 83.
Oswy, king of Bernicia, i. 83, 91-7, 103.
Ovania, battle of, i. 107.
Oxford, Balliol College at, founded by Dervorgilla, i. 270; Scots numerous there in 1450, i. 320; disturbances among students, i. 321.

Palladius, St., i. 9, 23-4, 19 *n.* 4, 30.
Panter, David, bishop of Ross, his character, ii. 34.
Paris, University, tears up a bull of Benedict XIII, i. 302; John Major at, i. 412; orders Luther's writings to be burnt, i. 417.
Parish churches, erection of, unsystematic, i. 216; to be built of stone and each to have a manse, i. 217; probably ugly and ill-cared for, i. 217; endowments, i. 217; tithes, i. 218; voluntary offerings, i. 219; practice of assigning, i. 219-20; property often secularized, i. 223; evil of pluralities, i. 224; pluralities sanctioned, i. 266; destruction of churches by nobles, i. 290-1; new, founded in fourteenth century, i. 291-2; collegiate (St. Giles', etc.), i. 318, 319; controlled by municipalities, i. 320; not destroyed by Reformers, ii. 108.
Parliament of Scotland, meeting of Estates at Scone, i. 260; beginnings, i. 270 and *n.*; made grants for poor scholars, i. 295; determines Church matters, i. 311; appoints prayers for King to be part of mass, i. 337; declares finally for the true Pope, i. 342; opposes Pope's claims over bishops, i. 345; threat to withhold payments from Pope, i. 353; asks Pope to settle dispute between St. Andrews and Glasgow, i. 353; act of 1496 for education of barons' sons, i. 376; act against Lutheranism, i. 415, 416; act to reform kirks and kirkmen, i. 450; threatens death to heretics, i. 459; new independence, ii. 5; landed gentry sit in, ii. 5; in 1560 opened July 9, adjourned to August 1, ii. 137; numbers attending, ii. 140 and *n.*; Lethington chairman, ii. 141; requests barons and ministers to draw up Confession of Faith, ii. 141; acts against Roman Church, ii. 143; action equivalent to a revolution,

ii. 145; function to register facts, ii. 146.
Patrick, St., his early life, i. 30-2; relations to Rome, i. 30, 36-7, 86; ordination of, i. 31 *n.* 1, 32, 36; evangelism in Ireland, i. 32-4; historicity, i. 30, 34, 35-6; contests with druids, i. 34-5; missionary policy, i. 34; view of baptism, i. 32, 34; success of mission, i. 35, 37; Church legends of, i. 36-7; relation to St. Bride, i. 27.
—— Dr. David, on 'Culdee Library,' i. 151.
Paul III, Pope, lays interdict on Scotland for arrest of Beaton, ii. 437.
—— IV, Pope, appoints a Visitor to inquire into abuses, ii. 36; laments his blunders as Pope, ii. 111.
Paulinus, mission at York, i. 75-6.
Peada, king of Middle Angles, i. 83.
Peasantry, independence of, ii. 8; importance in Reformation, ii. 8.
Peblys, John, papal collector, i. 287; his blundering led Scotland to declare for the antipope, i. 288.
Pelagius, i. 8-9.
Penda, king of Mercia, i. 76, 83.
Perth, settlement of Dominicans at, i. 197, 198 *n.*; school at, i. 201 and *n.*; Council meets at, and supports Crusade, 236 and *n.*; General Council in, 1418, to consider claims of Martin V, 314; Council in 1420, i. 316; monastery of Carthusians founded by James I, i. 364; Observants' Friary, in 1460, i. 365; Grammar School well attended, i. 375; attack on Dominicans, i. 446; Beaton holds cruel assize at, i. 467; Grammar School, ii. 6; monasteries and Charterhouse destroyed, ii. 102; Regent enters after the 'Appointment,' ii. 104; Lords enter, ii. 105.
Peter's Pence, origin of, in Church of England, i. 104.
Picts, first use of name, i. 6; affinity to Scythians, i. 11; of Galloway, i. 12-13; descents on W. Britain, i. 17-18; opposition to Irish migrations, i. 24-5, 51; Columba's missions to, i. 59-62; bishop of, appointed, i. 104.
Pilgrimages, in early British Church, i. 8.
Pinkie Cleugh, battle of, ii. 19.
Pius IV, Pope, did little to stem Reformation, ii. 111.
Pope, early use of the title, i. 9 *n.* 2.
Popes first send legate to Scotland, i. 183; give lucrative benefices to foreign favourites, i. 224; declare Scottish Church independent, i. 229; legates driven away, i. 234-5; legates assaulted i. 259-60; at Avignon, i. 278; reserve provision of bishoprics, i. 280; grants to irregular beneficiaries, i. 283; three at one time, i. 303; antipope sends nuncio to Scotland, i. 305-6; true Popes during the Great Schism, i. 300-1; Urban VI tries to win Scotland, i. 306; Boniface IX tries to control appointment of bishops, i. 306; legate refused entry to Scotland, i. 403.
Printing, first Scottish, in 1507, i. 387.
Protestants, i. 426 and *n.*; original meaning, i. 427.
Provost, office of, in Celtic Church, i. 58.

Rederic, king of Strathclyde, i. 21.
Regulus (Rule), St., legend of, i. 10-11, 113, 124, 140.
Reid, Robert, bishop of Orkney, i. 410; his character, ii. 34; poisoned in France, ii. 22, 34; decorates St. Magnus' Cathedral, ii. 34; advocate of peace with England, ii. 35; bequest for College in Edinburgh, ii. 35 *n.*
Religious life before 1300, i. 246; cared for by Observant Franciscans, i. 366; non-residence of clergy, i. 368; same about 1500, i. 387-8.
Renaissance in Scotland, i. 386; ii. 1.
Resby, James, Lollard, condemned for forty heresies, i. 326; burnt by Laurence of Lindores, i. 326.
Rimini, Council of, i. 8.
Ripon, Celtic monastery at, i. 82; becomes Benedictine, i. 92.
Robert I, king of Scotland (Bruce), bishops who favoured him, i. 253; crowned king, i. 254; absolved

on eve of Bannockburn, i. 255; twice excommunicated, i. 258; Papal bull against, i. 260 and *n.*; his treatment of legate, i. 260; sends Randolph to intercede with Pope, i. 262; restored to papal favour, i. 263; purity and piety, i. 272; gifts to the Church, i. 272; behaviour at Bannockburn, i. 273; death, i. 264.
Robert II (Stewart), king of Scotland, i. 277, 297.
Roman Christianity, influence in early Britain, i. 13-15.
—— Church in sixth century, i. 46-7; Columba's relation to, i. 55; Patrick's relation to, i. 30, 36-7, 86.
—— Occupation of Britain, the extent of, i. 4-7, 11; wall system, i. 4-7; influence on religion of North Britain, i. 5, 10-11; influence on religion of South Britain, i. 7-10; archæological remains, i. 5, 10.
Rome, corruptions in the Church at, which infected Scotland, i. 373.
Rona, Columban settlement, i. 58.
Ronan, missionary in Northumbria, i. 91.
Rosemarkie, i. 45, 99 *n.* 5, 283.
Rosnat, name given to Whithorn in Ireland, i. 18.
Ross, bishopric of, A.D. 1128, i. 166, 206.
Rossy, Father, of Dundee Greyfriars, a leading statesman, i. 295; a 'King's Limner' appointed in his time, i. 295.
Rough, John, Reformation preacher, in St. Andrews Castle, ii. 49; a martyr at Smithfield, ii. 49 *n.*; controversy with friars, ii. 50; defends, with Knox, articles of doctrine, ii. 50.
Round towers, i. 144.
Ruthwell, Holy Rood of, i. 108-9.

Sabbath observance, in Celtic Church, i. 53; insisted on by Queen Margaret, i. 158; recommended by James III, i. 389.
Sadleyr, Sir Ralph, sent to Scotland, i. 433; conflict with Beaton, i. 439; opinion of the Scots, i. 439; ii. 121.
St. Andrews (*see also* Kilrymont), Columba's settlement, i. 62; legend of foundation by St. Regulus, i. 113; made religious capital, i. 120; King Constantine buried in, i. 121; called after St. Andrew, patron saint of Scotland, i. 123-4; made leading see of Scotland, i. 164; early synods at, i. 168 *n.*; Investiture struggle, i. 181; Culdee settlement at, i, 188-9; cathedral begun 1162, i. 209; Roger made bishop, i. 232; conflict about bishopric, i. 232; cathedral completed 1318, i. 268; Bishop Trail's Synodal Statutes, i. 312; University founded in 1413, i. 322; M.A. oath against Lollards, i. 330; an archbishopric in 1472, i. 346; disorders in Church finance, i. 350; proposal to transfer University to Perth, i. 376; foundation of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, i. 377; papal bull for college, Note L, i. 393-5; Bishop Forman's care of University, i. 411-12; P. Hamilton a student at, i. 417; Hamilton burnt at, i. 421; St. Mary's College founded, i. 440; attempt to visit for reformation, i. 442; favours Lutheranism, i. 453; St. Leonard's Well, i. 453; Alesius at, i. 463; Gavin Logie flees from, i. 464; Cardinal Beaton summons Council at, i. 470; Wishart brought to, 477; Wishart's martyrdom, i. 479; students at, in 1558, ii. 2; Beaton's murderers in the Castle, ii. 18; siege by Regent, ii. 18; castle captured and razed to the ground, ii. 19; Knox preaches and ecclesiastical buildings destroyed, ii. 105 *n.*; Knox revives Reformers' spirit, ii. 127; thanksgiving service for arrival of English troops, ii. 132; Wynram and other waverers join Congregation, ii. 132.
St. Fillans, Irish settlement at, i. 23.
St. Kilda, Columban settlement, i. 58.
Schevez, William, archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 349; made Primate, i. 351.
Scologs (scholars), i. 129, 141.
Scone, coronation stone placed at, i. 114; stone carried off by Edward I, i. 268; abbey destroyed in spite of Knox, ii. 108.
Scotia, use of the name, i. 111 *n.* 1.
Scotic Church, *see* Ireland.

Scots, origin in Ireland, i. 1; first use of the name, i. 6, 22; in North Britain, i. 10, 19; of Ireland attack W. Britain, i. 17-18.
Scottish Church—continuity of, i. 1; identified with national life, i. 1, 2, 111-12, 114-15; first use of term 'ecclesia,' i. 1, 112; distinctive character, i. 1-2; 'Scoticus mos' condemned, i. 1-2, 104, 112; founded by Columba, i. 23, 51-62, 67; emblem of, i. 37; becomes independent of English Church, i. 106-7; accepts Roman usages, i. 106-7, 112; erected independently of Rome and England, i. 112-13; Dunkeld becomes religious capital, i. 113-14; bishop replaces abbot, i. 114; differences from Church of England in Culdee times, i. 121; not subject to Rome in early days, i. 123; irregularities in early times, i. 225-6; independence declared, i. 228; papal Bull emancipates from England, i. 233; treaty of Brigham declares Church independent, i. 253; no Englishman to hold a benefice, i. 254; Rome's special daughter, i. 228 and *n.*, 233, 257, 273, 288; declaration of liberties, i. 260; educational efforts hindered by War of Independence, i. 269; declares for the antipope, i. 288; disorders through poverty of priests, i. 290-1; wealth of superior churchmen, i. 290; disorders in the Highlands, i. 304; Church life about 1400, shown in Synodal Statutes of St. Andrews, i. 312-13; disorders under James I to James IV, i. 356; Henry's VIII's attempt to subject to England, i. 403; disorders under James V, i. 407; disorders, i. 411.
—— nation, coarseness of manners in Highlands, i. 246, 285, 361; improvement in sixteenth century, i. 375; birth throes of modern, i. 413; burghers and trading-classes favour a Reformation, i. 460, 471; ready to rule itself as a Church, i. 486; change of policy towards France, ii. 20; more favourable to Reformation than England, ii. 55; choosing between France and England, ii. 112; nobility unwilling to accept Book of Discipline, ii. 176-7.
Scots College founded in Paris, i. 270.
Seaton, Alexander, denounces monks and prelates, i. 454.
Seghine, abbot of Iona, i. 91.
Septimius Severus, i. 6.
Serf, St. (Servanus), i. 19 *n.* 4, 23.
St. Serf's Isle in Lochleven given to the Church by king of Picts, i. 121, 122; Kirkness lands added by Macbeth, i. 122; 'Culdee Library,' i. 141, Note H, 150; Culdee properties handed over to Augustinian canons, i. 190; Prior Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronykil*, i. 321.
Skene, W. F., theory of Culdees, i. 131 *n.*
Skye, Columban settlements on, i. 58.
Somerset, Duke of. *See* Hertford.
Stanford, monastery at, i. 92.
Stewart, Alexander, primate, son of James IV, i. 336; death at Flodden, i. 355; Erasmus's eulogy of, i. 355; founded St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews, i. 377.
—— James, prior of St. Andrews, later Regent Moray, early life, ii. 58; Cecil asks Congregation about his desire for the Scottish crown, ii. 133 and *n.*; drew revenues of priory after Reformation, ii. 174.
Stilicho, i. 7.
Stirling, abbey of St. Mary founded, i. 172; Erskine of Dun sent to, by Congregation, ii. 101.
Straitoun, David, burned at Greenside, Edinburgh, i. 454.
Strathclyde, early inhabitants of, i. 18; British Church in, i. 18-25; Church in Dark Age, i. 109; subdued by Picts, i. 113.
Sumptuary laws after Pinkie, food control, ii. 20 *n.* 7.
Superintendents, appointed, ii. 138; their work, etc., ii. 166.

Templars, settlement near St. Andrews, i. 172; trial of, i. 267, 275.
Ternan, St., i. 24.
Tertullian, comments on Britons, i. 7.
Teutonic invasions, effect on British Christianity, i. 9, 16-17.
—— settlements, extent of, i. 17-18.
Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 103.

Theodosius, campaigns in Britain, i. 6.
Thomas, abbot of Dundrennan, Reform leader at Basel, i. 341; helps to elect Felix v as antipope, i. 341; finally became a papalist, i. 342.
—— the Steward, king's natural son, pluralities held by, i. 308.
Tighernac, Irish annalist, i. 99 *n.* 6.
Tiningham, monastery of, i. 81.
Tiree, Columban settlement, i. 23, 58.
Tonsure, divergences of, i. 38, 88-9; in Celtic Church, i. 55-6.
Tour, M. de la, first to suffer in Scotland for Lutheranism, i. 415.
Trail, Walter, bishop of St. Andrews, opposed by the true Popes, i. 306; reputation as an administrator, i. 310; character, i. 310; resisted Regent Albany, i. 310; gets act of parliament passed to prevent appeals to Rome during Schism, i. 311; his Synodal Statutes, i. 312.
Trent, Council of, i. 426; Beaton apologizes for disregarding the summons to, i. 438; opens in 1545, i. 470, ii. 13; Protestants unable to take part, ii. 13 *n.*
Trumuin, first bishop of Picts, i. 104; withdraws from Pictland, i. 106.
Tuda, bishop of Northumbria, i. 96.
Turgot, confessor to Queen Margaret, i. 155 and *n.*, 156 and *n.*; his departure, i. 157; nominated for St. Andrews, i. 162; appointed, i. 164; death, i. 180.
Twelve (number), in Scotic usages, i. 52.
—— Apostles of Erin, i. 46, 49.
Twopenny Faith, ii. 47.
Tyndale, William, his New Testament, i. 415; New Testament imported by Scottish traders, i. 416-17 *n.*; books burned, i. 427; translation of New Testament condemned in 1530, i. 429.

Valentia, i. 6-7, 11.
Vikings hold north of Scotland, i. 116.
Visitation of abbeys, etc., i. 442.

Wales, British Church in, i. 17, 20-1, 74, 76, 103-4.
Wallace, Adam, of Ayrshire, dealing with, as a heretic, ii. 28; his execution on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh, ii. 28.
—— William, guardian of Scotland, i. 253, 257; religious character, i. 271.
Waltheve, St., abbot of Melrose, life and miracles, i. 202-3.
Wardlaw, Henry, founds St. Andrews University, i. 322, 331.
—— Walter, bishop of Glasgow, a great scholar in Paris, i. 294; as authority for John of Fordun, i. 299; opposed by Pope Boniface IX, i. 306; made a cardinal, i. 306.
Wedderburn, three brothers, authors of *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, ii. 56 and *n.*, 94; their popularity, i. 461.
Wessex, conversion of, i. 83.
Western Isles (including Iona) given up to Norsemen for 150 years, i. 162; bishopric under Trondhjem, i. 204; under Argyll with seat at Lismore, i. 205; bishop had no real authority, i. 359; wild and lawless people, i. 359; cathedral in ruins, i. 360.
Whitby, monastery of, i. 93.
Whitby, Council of, i. 93-6, 37 *n.* 1.
Whithorn (Candida Casa), i. 178 *n.*; *see* Galloway, Ninian.
Wilfrid, abbot of Ripon, i. 92-6, 101-2, 103-4.
William the Lyon, king of Scotland, victories, i. 194; English vassal, i. 195; resists Pope's nominee to St. Andrews, i. 229; Scotland under interdict, i. 230; receives Golden Rose from Pope, i. 231.
Willibrord, missions of, i. 107.
Willock, John, of Ayr, Reformed preacher, i. 454 and *n.*, ii. 56-7; friend of Grey, Marquis of Dorset, ii. 56 *n.*; work in Edinburgh, ii. 74; at Regent's death-bed, ii. 135; Superintendent for Glasgow, ii. 138.
Winwaed, battle of, i. 83.
Wishart, George, i. 454; teaches Greek in Montrose, i. 455; connection with plots against Beaton, i. 472, 475 *n.*; in Zürich translates first Helvetic Confession, i. 473; description of, by Tylney at Cambridge, i. 473; preached at Dundee, Montrose and in the West, i. 476; the plague at Dundee, i. 476; meets Knox at Longniddry, i. 477; delivered up to

Beaton, i. 477; charges against, i. 478; his martyrdom, i. 478-9; influence in turning Scotland towards Swiss Reformers, i. 484.
Wishart, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, i. 253; crowns Bruce, i. 254; his character, i. 255; urged by Pope to make peace with Edward I, i. 258; Pope desires his liberation from England, i. 258.
—— William, archdeacon of St. Andrews, i. 224.
Witches, belief in, i. 389; many burned in Edinburgh in 1479, i. 389.
Women, position of, in time of Celtic Church, i. 146.
Worship in Celtic Church, i. 138.
Wyclif, John, defends English nation against the Popes, i. 278; resists monastic orders and the papacy, i. 296; relation to Scottish Lollardy, i. 323-4; his reforming opinions, i. 324; act of English Parliament against his preachers, i. 324; act 'de Heretico Comburendo' of 1401, i. 325; his doctrine mainly negative, i. 330.
Wynram, John, sub-prior of St. Andrews, possible author of Hamilton's Catechism, ii. 30, 31 *n.*; his early career and character, ii. 31; one of those who drafted the Scots Confession, ii. 31, 141; summons Knox to defend dogmas, ii. 52; sympathizes with Reformers, ii. 53.
Wyntoun, Andrew, prior of St. Serf's, his *Orygynale Cronykil*, i. 321; calls heretics Lollards, i. 326.

Xavier, Francis, Jesuit missionary, ii. 13.

York, capital of Deira, i. 17; Paulinus' mission at, i. 75-6.
York, bishop of, at the Council of Arles, i. 8, 10; bishopric proposed by Augustine, i. 74-5; bishopric founded by Wilfrid, i. 96; bishop received *pallium* from Rome, i. 107; superior to bishopric of Candida Casa, i. 109. *See also* Glasgow.

Zürich, Agreement of, drawn up by Calvin, ii. 15.
Zwingli, Ulrich, his leadership in Switzerland, i. 401.

Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press